



Informazioni su questo libro

Si tratta della copia digitale di un libro che per generazioni è stato conservata negli scaffali di una biblioteca prima di essere digitalizzato da Google nell'ambito del progetto volto a rendere disponibili online i libri di tutto il mondo.

Ha sopravvissuto abbastanza per non essere più protetto dai diritti di copyright e diventare di pubblico dominio. Un libro di pubblico dominio è un libro che non è mai stato protetto dal copyright o i cui termini legali di copyright sono scaduti. La classificazione di un libro come di pubblico dominio può variare da paese a paese. I libri di pubblico dominio sono l'anello di congiunzione con il passato, rappresentano un patrimonio storico, culturale e di conoscenza spesso difficile da scoprire.

Commenti, note e altre annotazioni a margine presenti nel volume originale compariranno in questo file, come testimonianza del lungo viaggio percorso dal libro, dall'editore originale alla biblioteca, per giungere fino a te.

Linee guida per l'utilizzo

Google è orgoglioso di essere il partner delle biblioteche per digitalizzare i materiali di pubblico dominio e renderli universalmente disponibili. I libri di pubblico dominio appartengono al pubblico e noi ne siamo solamente i custodi. Tuttavia questo lavoro è oneroso, pertanto, per poter continuare ad offrire questo servizio abbiamo preso alcune iniziative per impedire l'utilizzo illecito da parte di soggetti commerciali, compresa l'imposizione di restrizioni sull'invio di query automatizzate.

Inoltre ti chiediamo di:

- + *Non fare un uso commerciale di questi file* Abbiamo concepito Google Ricerca Libri per l'uso da parte dei singoli utenti privati e ti chiediamo di utilizzare questi file per uso personale e non a fini commerciali.
- + *Non inviare query automatizzate* Non inviare a Google query automatizzate di alcun tipo. Se stai effettuando delle ricerche nel campo della traduzione automatica, del riconoscimento ottico dei caratteri (OCR) o in altri campi dove necessiti di utilizzare grandi quantità di testo, ti invitiamo a contattarci. Incoraggiamo l'uso dei materiali di pubblico dominio per questi scopi e potremmo esserti di aiuto.
- + *Conserva la filigrana* La "filigrana" (watermark) di Google che compare in ciascun file è essenziale per informare gli utenti su questo progetto e aiutarli a trovare materiali aggiuntivi tramite Google Ricerca Libri. Non rimuoverla.
- + *Fanne un uso legale* Indipendentemente dall'utilizzo che ne farai, ricordati che è tua responsabilità accertarti di farne un uso legale. Non dare per scontato che, poiché un libro è di pubblico dominio per gli utenti degli Stati Uniti, sia di pubblico dominio anche per gli utenti di altri paesi. I criteri che stabiliscono se un libro è protetto da copyright variano da Paese a Paese e non possiamo offrire indicazioni se un determinato uso del libro è consentito. Non dare per scontato che poiché un libro compare in Google Ricerca Libri ciò significhi che può essere utilizzato in qualsiasi modo e in qualsiasi Paese del mondo. Le sanzioni per le violazioni del copyright possono essere molto severe.

Informazioni su Google Ricerca Libri

La missione di Google è organizzare le informazioni a livello mondiale e renderle universalmente accessibili e fruibili. Google Ricerca Libri aiuta i lettori a scoprire i libri di tutto il mondo e consente ad autori ed editori di raggiungere un pubblico più ampio. Puoi effettuare una ricerca sul Web nell'intero testo di questo libro da <http://books.google.com>

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

GoogleTM books

<https://books.google.com>



LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

491 .55

L97g

1973

v. 2

Spec. Lang.



This is an authorized facsimile of the original book, and was produced in 1973 by microfilm-xerography by University Microfilms, A Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

A
GRAMMAR
OF THE
PERSIAN LANGUAGE;
COMPRISING A PORTION OF
THE ELEMENTS OF
ARABIC INFLEXION;
TOGETHER WITH
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE STRUCTURE OF EITHER
LANGUAGE, CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE
TO THE PRINCIPLES OF
GENERAL GRAMMAR.
IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME SECOND.

By M. LUMSDEN, LL. D.

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC AND PERSIAN IN THE COLLEGE OF
FORT WILLIAM IN BENGAL.

پیش ازین گفته اند اهل سلف
عَدِرْ مَنْ صَنَّفَ قَدْ اسْتَهْدَفَ

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY T. WATLEY, AT THE HONORABLE COMPANY'S PRESS.
1810.

STAS

PK
1237
L86
1973
v. 2

~~71.55
4979
1973
25.2~~

~~2AS Ref.~~
Spent longer

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME SECOND.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY Chapter,	1
Of Particles,	29
Plan of the Syntax,	32
Composition and division of Sentences,	55
Of personal Pronouns,	64
Conjunctive personal Pronouns,	65
Disjunctive personal Pronouns,	75
Reciprocal Pronouns,	78
Demonstrative Nouns,	80
The Relative Pronoun,	89
Interrogative Pronouns,	107
Noun of time and place,	122
Generic Nouns (including the use of Articles,)	130
Proper Names,	145
Nouns of Number,	146
Collective Nouns,	ib.
Kenayaut,	147
Afwaut,	148
Itbaa,	149
Subject and Predicate,	ib.
Fael or Agent to an Active or Neuter Verb,	153
Nominative to a Verb in the Passive Voice,	154
Object of an Active and Transitive Verb,	159
Universal object,	207
Vocative,	209
Haul or Noun employed to describe the state of the agent or object of a Verb,	212

Tumcz

	PAGE.
Tumceez or Noun of Discrimination, - - -	223
Corroboration, - - -	226
Exchange of one word for another, - -	229
The relation of the Genetive Case, - -	231
Substantive Nouns accompanied by Attributives of any kind, - - - - -	254
Noun of Superiority, - - - -	276
Of the Verbal character, - - - -	282
Imperfect Verbs, - - - -	298
Perfect Verbs, - - - -	320
Application of Tenses, - - - -	321
The Imperative Mode, - - - -	341
The Prohibitive, - - - -	345
General Principle, - - - -	348
On Verbs considered as Active or Neuter, - -	356
On the interchange of Persons, - - - -	360
Occasional omission of Persian Verbs, - - -	364
The relation existing between the <i>بشر</i> and the <i>جبر</i> .	367
Of Particles, - - - -	372
Of the significance of certain Letters of the Alphabet,	387
Of Persian Particles and other Words comprising more than one letter. }	424

N. B. The account of these Particles extends to the end of the Volume, and as they are treated in the order of alphabetical arrangement, any one of them may be easily discovered by the reader.



O F S Y N T A X.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

I PROPOSE, in this Chapter, to offer a few observations on the nature of the parts of speech, as defined in the writings of Eastern Grammarians. The definitions to which I allude, differ, in many essential points, from those of the corresponding parts of speech, as commonly defined by the Grammarians of Europe: but it cannot be unimportant to investigate the opinions generally entertained by others on this subject; and when these are fully known, it will then be in the power of every reader, to adopt or reject them according to the dictates of his own judgment.

THE Persian Grammarians recognise three parts of speech, termed **اسم** and **فعل** and **حرف** or **NOUN**, **VERB**, and **PARTICLE**. The term **فعل** comprises only the **TENSES** of a **VERB**, with the **IMPERATIVE MODE**; and the **NOUNS**, **POUNDS**, **ADJECTIVES**, **PARTICIPLES**, **ADVERBS**, **INFINITIVES**, and several seeming **PREPOSITIONS**, are invariably assigned to the class of nouns. Under the term **حرف** or **PARTICLE**, are comprised **MOST PREPOSITIONS**; **ALL CONJUNCTIONS**; **ALL TERMINATIONS** which are not significant in their own right; and also certain **ARTICLES**, such as **ال** in the Arabic or **A**, and **THE**, in the English Language. To these have been added (whether accurately or not) the substantive verb **است** *Is*; together with the vowel **ع** and the

A

the letter **نون**, which are said (as we shall see in the sequel) to be sometimes used in the sense of the substantive verb.

THE term **فعل** or VERB, is defined to be a word used to denote a certain idea, having a necessary or essential reference to past, present, or future time ; in opposition to the word **اسم** or NOUN ; which is said to denote a certain idea, having no essential, though it may have an accidental reference to past, present, or future time. The term **حرف** or PARTICLE, is said to denote a certain idea as it exists in some one or more words with which the particle must be therefore connected in a sentence. Or, to express the same sentiment in another way, the particle is supposed to be dependent, for the significance of its character, on certain other words with which it must be therefore invariably connected. The definition of the particle will be considered hereafter ; and we now proceed to consider the definitions of the verb, and of the noun.

It appears, from these definitions, that time is an essential characteristic of the verb ; or in other words, that a verb is the only part of speech, that must, necessarily and invariably, denote a certain idea, having a reference to past, present, or future time. It also appears that time is not an essential characteristic of the noun ; or in other words, that there is not, in any language, a single class of nouns (as the infinitive or the participles for examples) that must, necessarily and invariably, denote a certain idea, having a reference to past, present, or future time.

It must not, however, be inferred, that every individual noun is utterly incapable of marking time, because time is not an essential characteristic of the noun ; for, on the contrary, there is no doubt that time is *accidental* to many nouns ; as the infinitive, in the Latin Language ; and many participles, in various tongues ; and hence it is obvious, that the question to be considered, is not whether time be or be not inferred from a given infinitive, or a given

given participle ; but whether time be essential, and not accidental, to a verb on the one hand ; and whether it be accidental, and not essential, to every species of nouns on the other hand.

IN other words, we are to consider, what is essentially necessary to both ; and we are not to encumber the discussion by enquiring into the accidents of either ; because it is obvious, that what is *accidental* to a word can never be *essential* to it, and consequently that a noun, a verb, or a particle, would continue to maintain its place among the parts of speech, though all its accidents were taken away.

THAT time is essential to every verb is a proposition that must be admitted if the terms *فعل* and *VERB*, shall be understood to convey the same idea ; for as the term *فعل* has already been defined to be a word used to denote a certain idea, having a necessary or essential reference to past, present, or future time ; so, it follows, that this term will cease to be applicable to every word, which cannot be accurately comprised under the terms of the definition. On the other hand, every word, (of whatever species) to which time is truly essential, may be accurately comprised under the term *فعل* ; for if it correspond, in its nature, with the preceding definition of that term, there can be no good reason for withholding an appellation, to which, in that case, it will be justly entitled.

I SHALL therefore employ the term *فعل* in the sense which has now been given to that term ; using the English word *VERB*, by way of distinction, in its common acceptation : and having assumed the position, that time is essential to every *فعل*, I shall then proceed to consider, *first*, what species of words may be accurately comprised under the term *فعل* ; and, *secondly*, whether that term be accurately applicable to certain nouns, (such as the infinitive or the participles for example) which have been commonly

monly supposed to denote a certain idea, having a necessary or essential reference to past, present, or future time.*

THAT time is essential to the various *tenses* of every verb, is a proposition that cannot be denied; since it is time alone, that constitutes a tense; and, consequently, if time be abstracted from any given tense of any given verb, such tense may still continue to retain its character as a verb, according to our idea of that term; but its character as a tense will be entirely destroyed. To explain by an example. The word **LOVETH** is the present tense of a verb: it may be resolved into **IS LOVING**: it denotes **AN ATTRIBUTE, TIME, and AN ASSERTION**. But if assertion alone

* THE reader is supposed to be acquainted with the nature of **ATTRIBUTIVES** (of which the verb is one species), as explained by Mr. HARRIS. The reasoning of Mr. HARRIS, so far as it is necessary to notice it here, is intended to demonstrate, *first*, that every verb denotes an attribute, time, and an assertion; *secondly*, that every participle denotes an attribute, in conjunction with time; and, *finally*, that every adjective denotes an attribute, without reference to time. It follows therefore, according to his theory, that **ASSERTION** is an essential characteristic of the verb; and that **TIME** is an essential characteristic of the participle; because there is nothing but time and assertion, to distinguish these from other parts of speech. It also follows, that no word can be a verb, which implies no assertion; and that no word can be a participle, which implies no reference to time; because the terms **VERB** or **PARTICIPLE**, as applicable to any given word, necessarily imply the existence, in that word, of every thing which is essential to the one or the other. But if it be essential to every verb to denote an attribute, time, and an assertion; then must all these circumstances concur to constitute a verb; and the absence of any one will destroy the verb, though the other two may continue to be present. For *assertion* is termed an essential characteristic of the verb, because it is the only circumstance, by which a verb can be easily distinguished from other parts of speech; but it does not follow, that there is nothing essential to the verb, but assertion alone. On the contrary, the circumstances of *time*, and of *the attribute*, may be not less essential to verbs, than assertion itself; but if it be true, that **ALL** these circumstances are equally essential to verbs, and that assertion is essential to verbs alone, then does assertion constitute a better characteristic of the verb than time, or the attribute; which are supposed to be essential, not only to verbs, but to participles also. But **ASSERTION** alone has been supposed by some writers to be sufficient to constitute a verb, without reference to the circumstances of **TIME** or the **ATTRIBUTE**; which are thought, by these writers, to be accidental, and not essential, to that part of speech. (SEE **ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA** ARTICLE **GRAMMAR**.) I shall therefore, leave the reader to the exercise of his own judgment, on the question, whether or not a simple assertion be sufficient to constitute a verb; observing, only, that if it be sufficient for that purpose, a simple verb has nothing to do with tense, since assertion, abstracted from time, is the same in every tense; and that it has nothing to do with an infinitive or imperative mode, since neither of these modes denote assertion.

be

be essential to a verb, it will continue to be a verb, though the circumstance of time were taken away; and if time be essential to a tense, it must cease to be a tense, as soon as it shall cease to denote past, present, or future time.

It may be inferred, therefore, **THAT THE TENSES OF EVERY VERB ARE ACCURATELY COMPRISED UNDER THE TERM** **فِعْلٌ** and the **IMPERATIVE MODE** may be included under the same term with equal accuracy; *first*, because it denotes a command; and *secondly*, because every command must, by its own nature, imply a reference to present or future time, since it cannot be referred to past time, without an obvious absurdity*.

It remains to be considered, whether time be essential to any of those parts of speech which are included, by Eastern Grammarians, under the term **اسْمٌ** or **NOUN**; but as **INFINITIVES** and **PARTICIPLES** are the only species of nouns, to which time can be considered as essential on any principle, it will be sufficient to endeavour to prove that time is not essential, but only accidental, to every infinitive, and every participle; and, in the event of my suc-

* Whatever may be true at all times, can have no essential, though it may have an accidental reference, to a given time: but **AN ASSERTION** may be true at all times, as "The whole is greater than a part:" or "The whole is equal to all its parts." An assertion, therefore, has no essential, though it may have an accidental reference to a given time; that is to say, it has no essential reference to past, to present, or to future time. And whatever cannot be referred to all times, must have an essential reference to a given time: but a **COMMAND** cannot be referred to all times; that is to say, it cannot be referred to that portion of time which elapsed before it was uttered. Every command must, therefore, have an essential reference to that portion of time which is to succeed its utterance; that is to say, it must have an essential reference to present, or future time.

Before I put an end to this note, I think it necessary to state, that *time* or *time* is not in my opinion, *essential*, but only *accidental* to every verb. The reasons on which my opinion is founded, will be fully detailed in the course of this chapter; and, in the mean time, I shall only observe, *first*, that the term **فِعْلٌ** is intended, by the Eastern Grammarians, to be applicable only to verbs; *secondly*, that their definition of that term, which is copied into the text, describes merely the nature of a tense; *thirdly*, that there are tenses of the infinitive and the participles, as well as tenses of the verb; *fourthly*, that these tenses are *accidental*, but not *essential*, to any one of the parts of speech; and, *finally*, that the definition of the term **فِعْلٌ** which has been copied into the text, is therefore not less accurately applicable to the tenses of an infinitive or a participle, than it is to the tense of the verb itself.

cess, it will not be contended, that time is essential to any other species of noun.

THE infinitive is not inflected in the Arabic and Persian languages, as it is in the Latin, and other tongues; and the Arabs have not even distinguished, by any alteration in the form of the word, the infinitive in the active, from that in the passive voice; so that ضرب may signify *Beating*, or *Being beaten*; (that is, *to beat*, or *to be beaten*;) قتل *Slaying*, or *Being slain*; &c. just as the English words *slaying*, or *slaughter*, have the same double sense in the two following examples:—"The slaying or slaughter of these innocent men was a crime of the greatest magnitude." "The slaying or slaughter (on the side) of the enemy was very great."

IT is probable, therefore, that the Arabian Grammarians know nothing of those inflexions of the infinitive which are termed its *senses* in Latin Grammar: such as AMARE, *To love*; AMAVISSE, *To have loved*; AMATURUM ESSE, *To be about to love*; and as they have only PAST AND PRESENT PARTICIPLES (or, to speak more accurately, ACTIVE AND PASSIVE PARTICIPLES) they are equally ignorant, in all probability, of the nature of that noun, which is termed THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE; as MORITURUS, *About to die*; RECTURUS, *About to rule*; REGENDUS, *About to be ruled*; and others of the same description.

* I believe the infinitive of the active voice often acquires a passive sense in every language; as in the case of PETER PINDAR's Razor Grinder, who states that his Razors were made *to sell*; that is to say, that they were made *to be sold*. So also the verb دیدن *To see*, acquires a passive sense in the following example from the خوان خایلی.

برای دیدن ایزد آفریدش . و کر خود را ندیدان کس کردیدش

"God created him *to be seen*; and he who has once seen him, loses (in the contemplation of his beauty) all knowledge of himself."

The Arabic however is the only language, so far as I know, in which there is no distinction of form, peculiar to the infinitive in the passive voice; and hence it may be inferred, that the infinitive, in that language, (and I suppose in every other) denotes simply the name of an event.

But

BUT every INFINITIVE, and every PARTICIPLE, must comprise in itself all that is essential to an infinitive or a participle, and the difference between two infinitives, or two participles, or two modifications of the same infinitive, constitutes properly the accidents of each. If it can be proved therefore, that time is not essential to the infinitive, it will be of no consequence that a given infinitive such as AMARE, or AMAVISSE, or AMATURUM ESSE, does, in fact, denote past, present, or future time; and so, also, if time be not essential to a participle, its accidental occurrence in the participles MORIENS, MORTUUS, and MORITURUS, will be of no importance.

Now the infinitive has already been defined to be THE NAME OF AN EVENT; with or without reference to its occurrence, but without the least reference to the time of its occurrence; and it is admitted by all the late Grammarians, that the infinitive, like other names, is merely an abstract substantive noun; since there is no difference between LOVE, LOVING, and TO LOVE; DEATH, DYING, and TO DIE; &c. as we have already seen.* It follows, therefore, that the simple infinitive, stripped of its accidents, has no reference to time any more than those abstract substantive nouns with which it corresponds; and accordingly, the simple infinitive, like the name of a substance, may become the subject of a general proposition, in which it has not the least

* There is always that distinction between THE INFINITIVE and THE NAME MURDER, which I have already explained on a former occasion; but every infinitive may be used in the sense of an *Idmé* Murder; and every *Idmé* Murder may be used in the sense of an infinitive properly so called; or, in other words, both may be used as abstract substantive nouns, to denote merely the name of an event, without reference to its occurrence; or both may be used as infinitives, to denote the occurrence of the event with reference to that relation which exists between it, and a given substantive noun, which would be the nominative or agent to the tense of the verb. Thus the infinitive TO DIE is used as an *Idmé* MURDER, in the following example from SPENCER, as quoted by Mr. HARRIS.

For not, to have been dipt in Lethe lake,
Could save the son of THETIS from To DIE.

And, on the other hand, the substantive DEATH is used as an infinitive properly so called, whenever it is connected with that substantive noun, which would be the nominative or agent to the tense of the verb; as *my death*, or *his death*, &c.

reference

reference to time ; as when we say, " To die, is common to all men ;" " Iron is the most useful of all the metals. *"

On the other hand, **EVENTS** of every species have a natural and obvious capacity to assume the accident of time ; because they have not, like a substance, any permanent existence in nature ; and are often, on the contrary, so exceedingly transitory, that we have barely time to perceive their occurrence, before they are snatched from our view ; as in the *flashing of lightning* for example ; the commencement, duration, and completion of which, are divided by points of time infinitely too small to be obvious to the senses, although they may doubtless enter into the conception of the mind.†

It is easy to conceive, therefore, that every event, with reference to its fleeting and transitory nature, may be accurately typified in language by three or more substantive nouns or names ; the first being the name of *the present event* ; the second being the name of *the past event* ; and the third being the name of *the future event* ; or the name of the event considered with reference to its future occurrence. Accordingly, certain events, such as that signified by the word **DAY**, for example, are so typified in every language ; as when we say **TO-DAY**, **YESTERDAY**, and **TO-MORROW** ; and the difference existing between these three substantive nouns, is precisely of the same nature, with that which exists between the three inflexions of a Latin infinitive.

THE Latin infinitive does therefore mark PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE TIME ; as the words TO-DAY, YESTERDAY, and

* If the infinitive **TO DIE**, were used to denote present time, the assertion in the text would be absolutely false ; for all men are not now dying ; that is to say, to die, in time present, is not common to all men.

† Every event must have a *beginning* ; and, consequently, may have an *end*. Every event, therefore, must be contemplated by our minds in a transitory point of view ; though I grant it to be true, that any given event, as *love*, *hatred*, or *aspirin*, being once begun, may be conceived, by the mind, to endure for ever.

To-

TO-MORROW, mark past, present and future time; but time is not essential to the infinitive, any more than it is to other substantive nouns; because an infinitive, stripped of its accidents, is merely the name of an event; with or without reference to its occurrence; but without the least reference to the *time* of its occurrence; and the accidents of the infinitive are these; that it may be the name of A PRESENT, A PAST, OR A FUTURE EVENT.*

I NOW proceed to consider the nature of PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE PARTICIPLES, Active and Passive.

THE *اسم فاعل* OR ACTIVE PARTICIPLE, is defined to be THAT ADJECTIVE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO THE TRUE AGENT OR NOMINATIVE TO A VERB; † and the *اسم مفعول* OR PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, is defined to be THAT ADJECTIVE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO ITS TRUE OBJECT; or, in other words, to the substantive noun which is exposed to the action of the verb. Thus, if I beat another man, I am the *فارب*, that is, *the*

* If the observations in the text be founded in truth, it follows, *first*, that the infinitive, in all its inflexions, is merely an abstract substantive noun or name; and, *secondly*, that the inflexions of an infinitive might be not less numerous than the tenses of the verb which is derived from it; since the same reason that leads us to invent three different names for a *present*, a *past*, and a *future event*, might suggest to us a variety of other names for the same event, considered as *imperfect*, *preterperfect*, *pluperfect*?, &c. That all the inflexions of an infinitive are simple substantive nouns or names is a proposition that will be confirmed, I imagine, by the usage of every tongue; and that the Latin infinitive, with its three inflexions, represents *five tenses*, I collect from the ETON Grammar of the Latin language; in which AMARE is stated to represent two tenses; namely, the present and the preterimperfect, and AMAVISSE to represent two more tenses; namely, the preterperfect and the preterpluperfect of the infinitive mode. The third inflexion, namely AMATURUM ERIS, represents, of course, the future tense.

† It ought to be observed, that the definition in the text is common to simple adjectival nouns, as well as to active participles; since the word *خبر* Beautiful, which is a simple adjective, is doubtless applicable to that substantive noun which is the nominative or agent of the verb *يُحَسِّنُ* He was, or is beautiful, &c. And, in point of fact, the difference between a simple adjective, and an active participle, consists merely in this; that though both are applicable to the same substantive noun, namely, to that noun which is the nominative or agent to the tenses of the verb, yet the one denotes *the existence*, and the other, *the occurrence* of the attribute, in every noun to which it is imputed. (See Note, page 390).

beating man, or the beater ; and if I am beaten by him, I am the مَقْرُوب, that is, the person beaten.*

BUT the substantive is commonly omitted, after many Arabic and Persian adjectives, for reasons formerly stated ; (See page 157 et seq.) and hence, the participles are termed اِسْمُ فاعِل or NAME OF THE AGENT ; and اِسْمُ مفعول or name of the object, because, the substantive being omitted, the participle commonly supplies its place. Examples : مُحِبُّ A loving man, or A lover ; مَحْبُوب A person loved, or A mistress ; خَادِم A serving man, or A servant ; مُخَدَّوم A person served, or A master ; مُعْبَد A worshipper, or devotee ; مُعْبَدٌ A being who is worshipped, or A God ; كَاتِب A writing man, or A writer ; مَكْتُوب A thing written, or A letter ; حَاكِم A ruling man, or A ruler ; مُخَدَّوم A person ruled, or subjected to the command of another ; &c.

* Let the reader shou'd mistake the meaning of the word *object*, as it is here used, I think it necessary to state, that it is meant to include all those nouns to which a verb is transitive, whether with or without a preposition ; and to exclude all those nouns to which a verb is not transitive, though these may possibly follow the verb in the accusative case. If it be affirmed, for example, that *James struck John* ; or that *James spoke to John* ; it is obvious that the action of the verbs *To strike*, and *To speak*, are equally transitive to the substantive *John*, in either case : and thus the introduction of the preposition *to* after the verb *spoke*, bestows an *active and transitive character* on that neuter verb. But if it be affirmed on the other hand, that *James struck a blow*, or that *John fought a battle*, the words *blow* and *battle*, though properly put into the accusative case, are not exposed to the action of the verbs *To strike* and *To fight* ; and hence it follows, that they are not the *objects* of these verbs, in the sense in which the term *object* is now used. To say *James struck a blow*, or *John fought a battle*, is, indeed, precisely the same thing as if we said, *James struck* ; or *John fought* ; for the words *blow* and *battle*, being synonymous with the words *striking* and *fighting*, denote, merely, *the sense of the infinitive of the verb which precedes them*. Such accusatives (were it consistent with the idiom of our language) might be common to all verbs, without exception, whether active, passive, or neuter ; as *Drinking a drink* ; or *Walking a walk* ; or *Riding a ride* ; or *Dying a death* ; or *Sleeping a sleep* ; or *Dreaming a dream*, &c. That it is, in fact, extended to most verbs in the Arabic Language, is well known to every Arabic Scholar ; and hence it is termed by Grammarians مَفْعُولٌ مُطَّلَق or the *universal object* ; being that object, which is applicable to all verbs in the Arabic Language without exception. The object of a transitive verb is termed, on the contrary, مَفْعُولٌ بِه.

And

And so, also, in the Persian Language; as *نویسنده* *A writing man*, or *A writer*; *نوشته* *A thing written*, or *A letter*; *گوینده* *A speaking man*, or *A speaker*; *گفته* *A thing spoken*, or *A speech*, &c.

It follows, therefore, from this definition, that time is not essential to either of the participles; because a participle, stripped of its accidents, is merely that adjective which is applicable to the agent or the object of a verb.

BUT as every verb denotes the occurrence of an event, so every event, having no eternal or permanent existence in nature, must, of necessity, occur in past, present, or future time; and hence, it is easy to conceive, that three or more participles or attributives, may be accurately ascribed to the agent or the object of every verb; the first, or present attributive, being applicable when the event is actually present or going on; the second, or past attributive, when the event is past; that is, when it has existed at some preceding period of time, whether it exist at present or not; and the third, or future attributive, when the period of its existence is near at hand.

THIS I conceive to be a true account of the present, the past, and the future participles, active, passive, and neuter; as *MORIENTIS Dying*; *MORTUUS Dead*; and *MORITURUS About to die*; &c. and hence it follows, *first*, that every participle is active, which is applicable to the true agent or nominative to a verb; *secondly*, that every participle is passive, which is applicable to the true object or sufferer; *thirdly*, that a passive participle cannot be accurately derived from any other than a transitive verb; and, *finally*, that many passive participles are improperly considered, in our language, as active participles of the past tense.

THAT a passive participle cannot be derived from any other than

than a transitive verb must be sufficiently obvious; since verbs of every other species, having no object to which they are transitive, are of course defective in that adjective, of which the characteristic is, that it shall be applicable to the object of a transitive verb. Accordingly, the passive participle is never derived from any Arabic verb which does not also possess the passive voice; and the same thing must be true in every language, because it is founded in reason, and the nature of things. *

IT remains to be shewn that many passive participles are improperly considered, in our language, as active participles of the past tense.

THE difference between two or more participles, derived from a neuter verb, or from the same voice of an active or a passive verb, must consist in time alone; because such participles, however numerous, will be successively applicable, at different times, to the same object: as in the case of *MORIENS Dying*; *MORTUUS Dead*; and *MORITURUS About to die*; which are obviously descriptive of the same individual (namely, the nominative to the verb *Morior*) with reference to the present, the past, or the future occurrence of his death. These, therefore, are accurately classed together under the terms present, past, and future participles; because there is nothing but time to distinguish one from another.

BUT the active and passive participles, as *Loving* and *Loved*; *Knowing* and *Known*; *Giving* and *Given*; *Seeing* and *Seen*; &c. cannot possibly be applicable at different times to the same object; because the distinction between them does not consist in this, that one denotes present, and another past time; (for, on the contrary, both are simple participles implying no reference to time;

* It is to be observed, however, that many neuter verbs become active or transitive, when followed by certain prepositions; as *James spoke to John*; *The Hounds run down the Hare*; *The Birds flew through the air*, &c. &c. In this case, the passive participle, like the passive voice, may doubtless be accurately derived from such verbs.

or both are participles of the present tense, implying a reference to present time,) but in this, that one is applicable to the agent and another to the object of the verb; or, in other words, that one is an **إِسْم فاعِل** OF PARTICIPLE OF THE ACTIVE VOICE; and the other, an **إِسْم مفعول** OF PARTICIPLE OF THE PASSIVE VOICE.

SUPPOSE, for example, that I *know*, or *am acquainted with*, a certain occurrence; it is obvious that this, to me, is a *known occurrence*; and that I am the person *knowing the occurrence*; or, in other words, that the participle *knowing* is that adjective, which is applicable to *me*, who am the nominative or agent of the verb *To know*; and that the participle *known* is that adjective, which is applicable to the word *occurrence* the true object of the same verb. Nor is it possible to conceive any instance, in which the simple or uncompounded participle *known* will be accurately applicable to the true agent or nominative of the verb *To know*; or any instance, in which the participle *knowing*, will be accurately applicable to the true object of that verb.

IT is obvious, therefore, that the participles *Knowing* and *Known*, *Loving* and *Loved*, *Giving* and *Given*, *Seeing* and *Seen*, &c. are distinguished, from each other, as active and passive participles; and that the passive participles *Loved*, *Known*, *Given*, *Seen*, and others of the same description, can never be accurately considered (although they are so considered in every English grammar which I have seen) as active participles of the past tense*.

BUT

* In our Language, the active participle of the past tense, when formed from an active or transitive verb, is invariably compounded of the passive participle and the word *having*; as *having loved*, *having known*, *having seen*, &c. Now, it must be obvious, that this compounded participle is invariably applicable to the *agent*, and never to the *object* of the verb; since we affirm of the same individual, that he is at present *writing*, or has already *written a letter*; meaning, in the one case, that he is the person *writing the letter*; and, in the other case, that he is the person *having written it*; or the person who *wrote it*. But, if the word *having* be taken away, the second component part, namely *written*, will be invariably applicable to the *object*, and never to the *agent* of the verb; (or, in other words, it will be applicable

BUT many grammarians are of opinion, that the active participle, as *Loving*, invariably denotes *present time*; and that the passive participle, as *Loved*, invariable denotes *past time*; whereas, in point of fact, there can be little doubt that both are *simple participles*, implying no reference to time; or that both are participles of the present tense, implying a reference to present time.

THE active participle has been said to denote present time, because it invariably represents the action of the verb as *present* or *going on*, with reference to a certain period of time; as in the following examples, *I am writing now*; *I was writing yesterday*; *I will be writing tomorrow*; in which the action signified by the verb *To write*, is stated to be successively represented as present or going on, with reference to that period of past, present, or future time, which is expressed by the various tenses of the substantive verb. So, also, the passive, or as it is termed, the past participle, is said to denote past time on the same principle; *namely*, because it invariably represents the action of the verb as finished or completed, and consequently past, with reference to a certain period of past, present, or future time; as in the following example, *AMATUS FUERO I shall have been loved*; in which the participle *AMATUS* is said to denote past time with reference to the word *FUERO*; because, when that future time, expressed in the word *FUERO*, shall come to be present, the action contained in the participle *AMATUS* will then be finished or completed, and consequently past. (see *ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA*, Article Grammar).

Now the completion or termination of an action is doubtless inferred from many passive participles; for if we speak of *a written letter*, or *a fortified town*, the hearer knows that the letter

applicable to the letter, and not to the writer;) and must therefore be invariably a passive participle; and not, an active participle of the past tense. The Persian participle in

کُشته is used in both senses; as کشته Having slain, or The person slain; دیده

Having seen, or The object seen نوشته Having written, or a thing written, &c.

alluded

alluded to is already finished; and that the projected fortifications have been brought to an end. For as a letter is never completely written, while any part of it remains to be done, so it follows, that a *written letter* is an expression exactly synonymous with a *letter which has been written or finished*; and not with a *letter which we now write*; or *which we are now writing*; and hence it may be inferred, with the utmost accuracy, that the passive participle *written* does in fact denote past time, in one sense of the term; *first*, because it denotes an action already finished; and *secondly*, because every action which is finished, is necessarily past.

BUT if we substitute the participle *Loved*, for the participle *written*, the same inference cannot be drawn; for a *beloved friend*, (and so also of a *revelled friend*, a *detested foe*, and other similar examples,) is an expression exactly synonymous with a *friend whom we love*; and cannot, by any fair construction, be understood to signify a *friend whom we did love*, or *will love*, at any past or future period of time. It is obvious, therefore, that the passive participle '*Loved*' does not imply the completion or termination of the action signified by the verb *To love*; and that the hearer naturally infers from that participle *the present*, and not *the past or future operation* of the sentiment *Love*, on our minds. And as the existence of past time, in the passive participle, cannot be otherwise proved, than by means of that inference, by which every passive participle is supposed to denote an action already *completed or finished*, and consequently *past*; so that inference being founded in error, (since it is not true of every passive participle, though it is true of many) it follows that there is no proof that passive participles do essentially, or of necessity, though it is granted that many of them, (from the nature of their signification,) may accidentally denote past time.

THE following appears to be the principle, on which many passive participles, such as *written*, *fortified*, *built*, &c. denote

an

an action already finished, and consequently past; while other passive participles, such as *Loved, Esteemed, Revered, &c.* denote an action not yet finished, and therefore still present, or going on.

CERTAIN actions of the transitive class, such as *Love, Hatred, or Esteem*, may continue for ever, to be transitive to the same object; since the progress of these actions, as applicable to any given object, does not necessarily lead to their extinction or termination at any definite or indefinite period of time. Accordingly, a man may continue to love his friend, or hate his foe, with equal or encreasing vehemence, during the whole course of his life; and if his present existence were to endure for ever, the same thing would be true, so long as the nature of these events shall remain unchanged. There are other actions of the transitive class, such as *writing, reading, building, painting, &c.* which cannot be eternally applicable to the same object; for if we undertake to *write a letter*, or to *build a house*, it is obvious that every step of our progress, in the performance of such actions, is necessarily one step towards their completion or termination.

Now if the passive participle be derived from an action which may continue for ever to be transitive to the same object, the termination or extinction of that action will not be inferred from the passive participle; for if that inference were accurate, in such cases, we might continue for ever, to love our friends, or hate our foes, without being able to assert with truth, at any one period of time, that we reckoned among our acquaintances, a beloved friend, or a detested foe. Accordingly, the termination of such actions is never inferred from the passive participle, (because their completion and termination are not by any means synonymous terms;) and must be invariably expressed in positive or implied terms; as when we speak of a friend *formerly* beloved; a foe *formerly* detested; &c.

ON the other hand, every passive participle, derived from a finite action, does necessarily denote the completion or termination of that action; for as the passive participle has already been defined to be that adjective which is applicable to the true object of a transitive verb, or, in other words, to the substantive noun which is exposed to the action of the verb; so, if the action be finite by its own nature, no substantive noun can be completely, though it may be partially, exposed to its action, at any period of time preceding that in which the action is completely finished or concluded. Accordingly, *a written letter* means *a letter already finished*; and if the participle *written* be ascribed to an unfinished letter, it must be modified by the introduction of some word significant of that circumstance; as a letter *partly* written; a house *partly* built; a town *partly* fortified; &c.

BUT though every action which is finished, is necessarily past; and though many passive participles, such as *written*, *built*, *painted*, &c. denote an action already finished; there is much reason to believe, that all these are *simple* passive participles implying no reference to time; or that all are participles of the present tense, implying a reference to *present* time. For an action which is finished, and consequently *past*, in one sense of the term, may yet be considered as *present*, in another sense of the term; and it is perfectly obvious, that many finite actions are so considered in every language; as when we speak of a *surrounded army*; a *blockaded port*; and other similar examples.

FOR the action signified by the verb *To surround*, is completely finished, and consequently past, as soon as an army *surrounded* is completely encompassed; but we continue to affirm, in *the present tense of the verb*, that "one army *surrounds* another," not only during the whole of that period of time which is employed in the performance or completion of the action signified by the verb *To surround*; but also, during the whole of that subsequent period of time, which may elapse after an army is

E

completiv

completely surrounded, and before it is enabled to extricate itself.

It is obvious, therefore, (since it cannot be maintained, that the *present* tense of the [verb denotes *past* time) that the *relative position of the two armies*, as well as the action signified by the verb *To surround*, is often assigned to past, present, or future time, by the various tenses of that verb; and on this principle, it may be affirmed that the passive participle *surrounded* (if it imply any reference to time) is a participle of the present tense, implying a reference to *present time*; since it denotes, in the preceding example, (namely, *a surrounded army*,) the presence of that relative position of the two armies, to which I have now adverted.

On the same principle, the passive participle *written*, (or any other passive participle of the same class) may be also considered as a participle of the present tense; since there is no inconsistency in supposing the action signified by the verb *To write*, (any more than the action signified by the verb *To surround*) to be present in its effects, at any given period of time, subsequent to that in which the action signified by that verb, or, in other words, *the act of writing*, has been completely finished or concluded. In this case, *a written paper* means a paper in which the action signified by the verb *To write* is present in its effects, though the act of writing may have been long ago past; and thus, if we must maintain the existence of time in the passive participle, I cannot perceive any principle, on which the past can be accurately preferred to the present time.

BUT it is impossible to prove the existence of time in the present participle active (*LOVING*,) or the present participle passive (*LOVED*,) or the present tense of the infinitive, (*TO LOVE* or *TO BE LOVED*,) by any argument which may not be also used to prove the existence of time in a simple adjective noun; and I am therefore disposed to believe, that these are simple infinitives,
and

and simple participles; having not the least reference to time. For the present existence of an attribute, in a given object or substantive noun, will be naturally inferred from a simple adjective (as in the case of *a good man*, or a *beautiful woman*,) unless we are informed of the contrary, by the introduction of some word intended to rectify our ideas on that subject, (as a woman *formerly* beautiful, or a man *once* good) and in this respect, there is not the least difference between a simple adjective, and those active or passive participles to which I have now adverted.

AND so, also, the infinitive in the present tense, or, to speak more accurately, the simple infinitive, denotes merely the occurrence of a certain event; leaving the period of its occurrence, with reference to past, present, or future time, entirely undefined. And this is the reason why the infinitive in the present tense (that is to say, the simple infinitive) may accurately coalesce with every tense of the substantive verb; as when we say "To die is and was and will be common to all men," whereas the infinitive in the past tense (being the name of a past event) cannot coalesce with the substantive verb in the present tense; since it is not true that all men *have died*; or, in other words, that "To have died," or "To be now dead," is an event common to all men. And as it is equally untrue that all men *are now dying*; or, in other words, that death, dying, or to die, in time present, is an event common to all men; so, if the infinitive *To die* did in reality imply any reference to present time, the phrase "To die is common to all men," would contain an assertion absolutely false; but the assertion on the contrary is strictly true; and this seems to me to be a convincing proof that the simple infinitive has no reference, or at the most, an *occasional* reference to present time.

IT appears from the preceding observations, *first*, that the term *word* may be defined to be a word significant of a certain idea having a necessary or essential reference to past, present, or future time;

time; *secondly*, that the term اسم may be defined to signify a word denoting a certain idea, which has no essential, though it may have an accidental reference to past, present, or future time; *thirdly*, that the various tenses of a verb, and the imperative mode, are accurately comprised under the term فعل; and, *finally*, that the infinitive and the participles are properly assigned to the class of nouns; since time is not essential to either of these parts of speech, though it may be accidental to both.

BUT though I have been hitherto guided by the Persian Grammarians, in defining the term فعل to be a word used to denote a certain idea, having a necessary or essential reference to past, present, or future time; I am clearly of opinion, that time is accidental, and not essential, to every verb; and, consequently, that the definition of the term فعل conveys a very imperfect, and even erroneous idea, of the true nature of the term VERB. For though I am not certain that there is any such thing to be found in any language as a simple verb stript of its accidents, I have not the least doubt that time is accidental, and not essential, to every verb; or, in other words, that the verbal character would be unimpaired, though circumstance of time were taken away. And though time were essential, and not accidental to every verb, the preceding definition would still convey an imperfect idea of that term; *first*, because it defines merely the nature of a tense, to which time must be essential, and not accidental, since time is that which constitutes a tense, or that, without which, no tense can have any existence; and *secondly*, because there are tenses of the infinitive and the participles, as well as tenses of the verb; from which it follows, that the preceding definition, being equally applicable to the one or the other, must be insufficient to determine the difference between them.

THE following observations will convey to the reader a just idea of the true nature of verbs, and other words, whether primitive or derivative, according to the best of my judgment.

If language be considered on principles of reason, without regard to the particular structure of any given tongue, it must be admitted, that substantive nouns furnish the true and proper materials, from which verbs, adjectives, and participles, are necessarily derived. For the verbs, adjectives, and participles, of every tongue, denote merely the various modifications, of which a certain substantive is naturally susceptible; that is to say, they represent the sense of a substantive, modified by the addition of some other circumstance, by which it is converted, into a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun. And as the accuracy of this principle is entirely independent on the particular structure of any given language, so it is equally true, whether the substantive be the primitive; as in the case of *vice* and *vicious*; or the derivative, as in the case of *good*, *goodness*; *great*, *greatness*; and other examples of the same nature. For *great* and *vicious*, equally denote the existence of *greatness* and *vice*, in a given object or substantive noun; and though the one be a primitive, and the other a derivative adjective, yet neither would be intelligible, unless the sense of the corresponding substantive were preconceived by the mind.

It is obvious, therefore, that substantive nouns furnish the true and proper materials of language; without which, verbs, adjectives, and participles, can have no existence; and though it may be true, that there is not, in a given language, a corresponding substantive, for every participle, verb, and adjective noun, it may yet be affirmed, with certain accuracy, that there ought to be so; *first*, because all verbs are *attributive*, as will be shewn hereafter; and *secondly*, because no attributive can be intelligible, unless the sense of the corresponding substantive, which is comprised in it, be first understood.

SUBSTANTIVE nouns are divided into those which do, or do not, denote the name of a substance; that is to say, of some class of external or material objects whether animate or not; and most of the substantive nouns in every language, which do not

F

denote

denote the name of a substantive, must denote the name of an event ; because there are very few objects in nature, to which it is possible to assign a name, that may not be accurately comprised under one or other of these terms.

BUT the name of a substance is not naturally the source of derivation ; or to speak more accurately, the relative and the diminutive are the only species of nouns, with which it has a natural and obvious connexion ; and, accordingly, the relative, as *بِئَال* *A mulctee* ; *سَكِين* *Of stone* ; &c. or the diminutive, as *مَرْدَك* *A little man* ; *اِسْبَك* *A little horse* ; &c. are the only species of nouns, that are commonly derived from the name of a substance. But the name of a substance may become, in time, the name of *an event* ; as in the case of the word *saddle*, when we say of an individual that *he saddled his horse* ; and, in this case, the name of a substance becomes, like other events, the prolific source of *verbs, adjectives, participles*, and other derivatives of every species*.

FOR I have already had occasion to remark, that every event may be typified, in language, by a great variety of substantive nouns or *names* ; each noun denoting the name of the event, with reference to some particular division or subdivision of past, present, or future time. And hence it follows, that every tense of any given verb might have a corresponding tense or inflexion of the infinitive mode ; or, in other words, that the greatest possible number of both, which might belong to a given verb, is exactly the same.

BUT every inflexion of the infinitive mode may be considered,

* The name of a substance may often become the name of an event in every language ; as *To paper a room* ; *To saddle a horse* ; *To ink the paper* ; &c. And, on the other hand, the name of an event may often become the name of a substance ; as in the case of the word *seed*, when we speak of *a seed of corn* ; that is to say, that quantity of corn, which a horse usually consumes at one time.

by the mind, in either of two points of view ; that is to say, it may be used as an abstract substantive noun, to denote, merely, *the name of the event* ; without the least reference to that relation which exists between it, and a given substantive noun which would be *the nominative* or *agent* to the tenses of the verb ; or, it may be used as an *infinitive properly so called*, to denote the act of some one or more agents ; in which case, it must be accompanied (like the tenses of the verb) by the noun or nouns which mark the names of these agents. Thus *giving*, in the abstract, is a simple substantive noun or name ; but *giving*, considered as the act of an individual, conveys an imperfect idea, which must be accompanied by the name of *the giver*, and of *the gift*, and of *the person to whom it is given*, before it can be employed as the *subject* of a given proposition. Now this is the distinction, so often noticed by the Arabian Grammarians, between *the infinitive* and *the Ismê Musder* ; and as it is equally applicable to the infinitive, in every inflexion, so, it follows, that the number of *Musders* and of *Ismê Musders*, which might belong to a given verb, is exactly the same.

FROM the infinitive is derived, *first*, the ACTIVE PARTICIPLE, which denotes the OCCURRENCE of the infinitive in a given object or substantive noun ; as when we speak of " a man *daring* to commit a certain crime ; &c." *secondly*, the SIMPLE ADJECTIVE which denotes the EXISTENCE of the infinitive in a given object or substantive noun ; as when we speak of *a daring* or *an intrepid man* ; *a loving* or *an affectionate child* ; &c. *thirdly*, the PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, which denotes the TRANSITION of the infinitive to a given object or substantive noun ; as when we speak of *a written letter* ; *a blockaded port* ; or *a fortified town* ; &c. *fourthly*, the VERB IN ITS SIMPLE STATE, by which we PREDICATE or AFFIRM the sense of the infinitive to EXIST, or OCCUR in a given object or substantive noun ; as when we say of the Deity, that HE LIVETH FOR EVER, &c. and, *finally*, the verb in the *imperative* and *precativè modes* ; by which we *command* or *desire*, that the sense of the infinitive *shall exist* or *occur* in a given object or substantive noun ; as when we say,

Be

Be thou virtuous; Pardon our sins; Forgive our transgressions;
and other examples of that nature.*

It follows, therefore, if these definitions be founded in truth, that simple verbs are merely one species of *attributives*; differing from simple participles active and passive, just as the latter differ from each other; and as both differ from an adjective noun. For it is common to them all to ascribe the sense of the infinitive to a given object or substantive noun; and the essential difference between them consists, merely, in the manner in which the ascription is made, as already explained in the preceding paragraph.

On the other hand, the accidents of all are nearly the same; for if we except the distinctions of *case*, which is peculiar to nouns; and the distinctions of *mode* which is peculiar to verbs; there is not, perhaps, any one accident of a noun, that might not belong to verbs also; or any one accident of a verb, that might not be assumed by adjective nouns. For if mode be thrown out of the account, the other accidents of the verb consist in Gender, as *فَرَبَ* He struck, *فَرَبَتْ* She struck; in Number, as *فَرَبَ* He struck, *فَرَبُوا* They struck; in Person, as *فَرَبْنَا* We struck, *فَرَبْتُمْ* You struck; in Tense, as *فَرَبْتُ* I struck, *اَفَرَبُ* I do or will strike; and in their capacity to assume the degrees of comparison; an accident which it is well known, that they have actually assumed in the Sanscrit Language, where the degrees of beating (*I struck more or most*) can be expressed by certain inflexions of the verb, which have been invented for that purpose.

* I am unable to conceive, in what sense the term *assertion* is used by those Grammarians who maintain that the imperative mode denotes assertion; for if every assertion must, by its very nature, be partly or wholly *true* or *false*; it follows, that the imperative denotes no assertion; since we cannot affirm the truth or falsehood of any sentence, which is formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode.

Now these accidents, with the exception of tense and person, are known to be common to adjective nouns; and if we multiply, in idea, the inflexions of any given adjective, as *good* for example, we shall then have *three inflexions*, applicable to *the first, the second, and the third persons*; and *three more inflexions*, applicable to past, present, and future time. It is obvious, therefore, (since the principle is the same in every case) that the accidents of a verb, a participle, an adjective, and an infinitive, are, or might be, nearly the same.

BUT though it be essential to every verb, to predicate or affirm *the existence*, or *the occurrence* of its infinitive in a given object or substantive noun, it may possibly be thought, that the substantive verb *Is*, often denotes the existence, not of its own but of another infinitive, in the substantive noun to which it is imputed. For if it be affirmed of an individual that *he is wise or virtuous*, it is not *being* or *existing*, but *wisdom* or *virtue*, which we mean to ascribe to the substantive noun. And, in this case, the substantive verb seems to be used as a simple connective, or mark of predication; that is to say, it seems to have lost the attribute character, which I conceive to be essential to every verb.

It is to be observed, however, that the verb *To be* has two senses in the infinitive, as well as two senses in the tenses of the verb; for it signifies *existence*, when used as a perfect verb; (*To be* or *To exist*) and it denotes *the name of that connexion which exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition*, when followed by an attributive in the infinitive mode; as *To be good*; *To be virtuous*; *To be wise*; *To be worthy*; &c. According to this last sense of the verb *To be*, it may, I conceive, be accurately affirmed, that the word *is*, in the preceding examples, predicates the existence of its own infinitive in a given object or substantive noun; but the infinitive itself being merely the name of a certain connection, which cannot be understood unless the extreme terms of the proposition, that is to say, *the subject* and *the predicate*, be

G

also

Also known; so the word *is*, which affirms the existence of this connexion, must be also accompanied by both terms.

Or it may possibly be true that the verb *To be*, when used as a mark of predication or connexion, has lost the attributive character, which is essential to verbs; for when a given word denotes, in its original acceptation, a conjunction of two or more ideas, which might be represented by two or more words, it is a common operation of the mind, to deprive that word of a part of the compounded sense which it was formed to denote; and to employ it in the sense of the other part. And hence the word *اِقْتَبَسَ* (and there are many similar examples in the Arabic Language) may be said to have lost, in its common acceptation, the sense of its primitive *اِقْتَبَسَ* *A piece of fire, or a ray of light*; and to signify merely, *اِقْتَبَسَ* *To gather*, instead of *اِقْتَبَسَ* *To gather light or fire*, which is the literal sense*.

Now every infinitive, when used in its proper sense, denotes a conjunction of two or more ideas, which may be commonly expressed by an attributive and a mark of connexion; as *Wisdom* or *Being wise*; *Folly* or *Being foolish*; *Vice* or *Being vicious*; &c. and the sense of the substantive verb itself, when used to signify *existence*; (*To be* or *To exist*) may doubtless be rendered by the same mark of connexion, followed by the adjective *extant*; as *To be* or *To be extant*; *To be* or *To be existent*; &c. It is obvious, therefore, that the presence or the absence of the idea, signified by the adjective *extant*, determines the double sense of the substantive verb; and if it be granted, that this idea is comprised in the literal and genuine sense of that verb, it may yet be contended, that it forms only a component part of the whole sense, and may be consequently banished from our thoughts, as often as

* If the literal sense were kept in remembrance, we should never see such expressions as the following; *اِقْتَبَسَ نُورٌ* *To gather light*; because the use of the word *نورٌ* must, in that case, be wholly superfluous.

occasion requires, according to the principle which I have stated. With regard to the principle itself, I conceive its operation might be illustrated by numerous examples in every tongue; and I am not, therefore, disposed to think that the use of the substantive verb, as a mark of connexion, furnishes any important argument against the admission of the principle which I have endeavoured to establish; namely, that a verb, including the imperative mode, may be defined to be a word which affirms or commands the existence or the occurrence of its infinitive, in a given object or substantive noun.

I NOW proceed to offer a few observations on the nature of ADVERBS; which are merely one species of adjective nouns. When we affirm of an individual, that *He reads well*, or *dances ill*, it is precisely the same thing, as if we ascribed the adjectives *good* and *bad* to his *reading* and *dancing*; and so, also, if we say of a woman, that she is *uncommonly beautiful* or *remarkably handsome*, it is exactly the same thing, as if we imputed the adjectives *uncommon* or *remarkable*, to her *beauty* or her *fine shape*. But *fine shape* and *beauty* are the substantive nouns, of which the sense is comprised in the corresponding adjectives *handsome* and *beautiful*; and so, also, *reading* and *dancing* are the substantive nouns of which the sense is comprised in every tense of the verbs *to read* or *to dance*. It is obvious, therefore, that all adverbs modify the sense of that substantive noun, which is comprised in a given attributive to which they are imputed; whether this last be a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun; and as there can be no reason, but that of idiom, why a simple adjective should not be employed for the same purpose, so it need excite no surprise, that adjectives are so employed in the Persian tongue. Examples: *اَوْرَا سَحْت زَدِه بُوْدَم* I beat him severely; *مَرْد سَحْت كَوَش مُطَلَبش نَبَات دَرِيَا قَسَم* I understood his meaning well; *مَرْد بَد كَوَش* A man who labors hard; *مَرْد بَد كَوَش* An evil speaker, &c.

In all these examples, the sense of a given attributive is modified

diffied by a simple adjective noun; and consequently the adjective performs, in each example, the office of an adverb properly so called. So also, the Arabs very often employ a simple adjective noun for the same purpose, as ضَرَبْتُ شَدِيدًا *I beat him severely*; for ضَرَبْتُ ضَرْبًا شَدِيدًا *I beat him a severe beating*; &c. And as the substantive *beating*, when expressed in the sentence, must be necessarily put into objective case; (ضَرْبًا) so, the Arabic adjective شَدِيدٌ, or any other adjective that may be used adverbially, must be also put into the same case. (شَدِيدًا)

BUT the sense of an adjective may be often expressed by the cases of the corresponding substantive noun; since there is no difference, in point of sense, between *a wise man*, and *a man of wisdom*; *a virtuous man*, and *a man of virtue*; *a learned man*, and *a man of learning*; &c. And as adverbs are one species of adjective nouns, so, the use of these may be also superceded by the cases of the corresponding substantive noun; whether these cases be formed by the means of inflexion, as اَجْمَلًا *In substance*; تَدْبِيحًا *In detail*; وَفَعًا *At once*; بَغْتَةً *Suddenly*; اَبَـثَةً *Certainly*; &c. or by the use of prepositions; as فِي الْحَالِ *Immediately*; فِي الْجَمْعِ *In short*, or *In substance*; فِي الْغَوْرِ *In haste*; فِي الْوَاقِعِ *In truth*, or *In fact*; بِأَكْبَلٍ *Wholly*; بِالْبَقِيَّةِ *With certainty*; &c. So, also, the use of an adverb may be occasionally superceded by a compound epithet; or other attributive of any kind; as مَرَدُّ شَدِيدِ الْعَدَاوَةِ *A bitter enemy*; or *A man bitter in his enmity*; اَسْبَـبٌ بَـيْـزٌ *A swift going horse*; مِنْ هَرَوَقَتِ بَيَاوَاتِ نَهْرَبَانَ *An empire encreasing daily*; مَنْ هَرَوَقَتِ بَيَاوَاتِ نَهْرَبَانَ *I who am continually thinking of you my friend*; &c.

In short, the various modes in which the sense of a given attributive may be accurately modified in the Persian Language are very numerous; and as I am not able to form a comprehensive and perspicuous arrangement of these, I shall only observe,

on

on this subject, *first*, that there are very few words in the Persian Language which can be exclusively assigned to the class of adverbs, since almost every seeming adverb will be found to be a real adjective or a substantive noun; and, *secondly*, that the Grammarians of Arabia and Persia, as it might be expected in these circumstances, have not recognised the existence of adverbs, for which they have no corresponding term in either language.

OF PARTICLES.

I NOW proceed to consider the nature of PARTICLES, and to state the reasons which induce me to believe in the existence of this very questionable part of speech. A particle, that is to say a preposition or a conjunction, (and as I conceive, a termination also) has been defined by Mr. HARRIS, to be "a word devoid of all signification; but so formed as to unite two or more significant words, which refuse to coalesce or unite of themselves." Now it is not true, that particles are devoid of all signification; for if it were true, they would be utterly useless to the expression of our thoughts; *first*, because an insignificant word can signify nothing; that is to say, it can be of no use in the expression of our thoughts; and, *secondly*, because there can be no difference, in point of sense, between two insignificant words; from which it follows, that if particles were not significant words, any one particle might be used (if indeed it could be of any use) to supply the place of all the rest.

THE inaccuracy of this definition has not escaped the grammatical acumen of Mr. TOOKE; who discovered that most of the particles, in our Language, are Anglo-Saxon verbs or nouns; and has been thence led to conjecture, that all the particles of other tongues must be, of necessity, verbs or nouns.

THE following is a summary statement of the arguments adduced in favor of the theory of Mr. TOOKE. *First*, it appears, from the result of Mr. TOOKE's enquiries, that most of the

H
English

English particles are Anglo-Saxon verbs or nouns; *secondly*, it may be inferred, by analogy, that the hitherto undiscovered particles of the English Language are also obsolete verbs or nouns; *thirdly*, there is reason (so far as the enquiry has been hitherto carried) to form a similar judgment with regard to the particles of certain other tongues, ancient and modern; *fourthly*, there are very few particles in the infancy of Language; and the office of particles, in every uncultivated tongue, is commonly performed by verbs or nouns; *fifthly*, it is not probable that illiterate savages, the first cultivators of Language, should send abroad their faculties in quest of particles, that is to say, of words used to denote the abstract relations subsisting among their ideas; since nouns and verbs are sufficient for all the purposes of common speech; and *finally*, no Grammarian has been able to discover the *essential characteristic* of particles; or that which serves to distinguish a particle, from either of the other two parts of speech.*

BUT if the existence of particles, in the *present* state of any given language shall be once admitted, it will be always impossible to prove that they did not or might not exist in the infant state of every tongue; for if there be any such thing as a particle, contradistinguished from a verb or a noun, it must be absurd to affirm that there can be no such thing as a primitive particle. If the word *from* be now a particle, in our language, it will not therefore be of any importance to shew that it was once used, by the

* I have not, knowingly, omitted or misstated any of the arguments in favor of the theory of Mr. TOREY; but some of them, (particularly the last from which it is inferred, on grounds of probability, that particles are not essentially distinguished from either of the other two parts of speech), are extracted from the Grammatical Treatise in the ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA; and I know not whether they are to be found in the DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY or not. If I have fallen into any mistake of omission or commission, in the statement of these arguments, I beg the reader to believe that I would not *voluntarily* mislead his judgment. My object is truth; and though I believe it incumbent on me to give my opinions freely, on the subject of which I am treating, I am wholly unconscious of any desire to support a theory at the expence of truth. I have little to say on the subject of particles; and if my ideas, on the nature of that part of speech are founded in error; I shall be the willing convert of any body, who will take the trouble to set me right.

Anglo-Saxons, as a substantive noun to signify *the beginning*; for if it be not now an English substantive noun but a particle, the existence of particles must be fully established; and it will be absolutely impossible to assign any reason of necessity (though such an accident may often happen) why *any particle must have possessed formerly, a character different from that which it now possesses.*

Now, whatever may be thought of the present character of the word *from*, it will not be denied that there are many English words or terminations, (for I conceive the terminations of every language to be one species of particles,) which cannot, in their present state, be accurately comprised under either of the terms *verb* or *noun*; and, taking it for granted that the letter *s* of the plural number is one of these, I shall endeavour to ascertain the true character of that letter, considered as a word or sound significant of a certain idea; and thence to infer the true nature of other words or sounds, which must, like the letter *s*, be assigned to the class of particles; since they cannot be accurately assigned to either of the other two parts of speech.

THE letter *s* denotes plurality when added to the singular number of a substantive noun; as *house, houses; pen, pens; &c.* but if the substantive noun be taken away, the letter *s* will no longer convey the idea of plurality, or any other idea, to an English ear. So also the two *Alifs*, in the word *أقوال*, the plural of *قوله*, *A speech*, convey to the mind of an Arab the idea of plurality; but if the word *قوله* be taken away, the two *Alifs* will no longer convey that, or any other idea, to his mind. And as it cannot be imagined that the two *Alifs*, thus intermixed with the letters composing the word *قوله*, *A speech*, constitute the fragments of some obsolete and significant word; so, it cannot be presumed, unless we are prepared to prove the fact, that the letter *s* is the fragment of an Anglo-Saxon verb or noun. And if the fact were clearly proved, it would yet be a matter of no importance to the present
argu-

argument, unless we could also maintain that the letter *s* continues to be still a verb or a noun ; for if that letter be now a particle, the present existence of particles must be fully established ; and their existence at every former period of time must (as I think) be thence inferred.

Now the essence of every particle, or that which constitutes the distinction between it and either of the other two parts of speech, appears to me to consist in this ; that **NOUNS** and **VERBS** are invariably significant in every proposition, because they are truly significant in their own right ; whereas **PARTICLES** are not significant in every proposition, because they are not significant in their own right, but only, (as in the case of the plural *s*) in the right of some one or more words with which they must be therefore invariably connected. And the necessity of this connexion, to the significant character of every particle, will furnish the true criterion by which we shall be able to detect, on every occasion, the difference between a particle and the corresponding verb or noun.

To explain by an example. The word *from*, which is now a particle, denotes the same idea signified by the word *beginning*, which is a substantive noun. But the word *from* being a particle, (I speak of its present not of its past character) denotes the idea *as it exists in a given substantive noun by which it must be, therefore, invariably followed*. And if that noun be taken away, the meaning of the word *from* will disappear with it ; just as the plural sense of the letter *s* disappears when the substantive noun is taken away. For we cannot substitute the word *from*, for the word *beginning*, in the following sentence ; “ In the *beginning*, God created the heavens and the earth,” (I mean that we cannot say “ In the *from*, God created the heavens and the earth,”) and the reason is obvious ; *namely*, because the word *from* does not, in this combination, convey to the mind of an Englishman the idea signified by the word *beginning* ; and, if not *that* idea, it certainly conveys no other.

It

It may be inferred, therefore, that the word *from* (and so also of the letter *s*, if it shall be found, hereafter, that this letter corresponds, in point of sense, with any obsolete verb or noun) is now a particle, and that the word *beginning* is a substantive noun; and the difference between them consists, merely, in this; that though the idea signified by both is precisely the same; yet the noun, being significant in its own right, denotes that idea, or conveys it to the mind of the hearer, *without reference to any combination whatever*; (in other words the noun will be significant in every proposition;) whereas the particle denotes the idea *in a connected state*; and must, therefore, be accompanied by a given substantive noun, on which the significance of its character always depends. (In other words the particle will not be significant in every proposition).

AND the nature of this dependence cannot be confounded with that of either of the other two parts of speech, on those words with which they must be connected in order to form a perfect proposition; for though it be true, that the word *beginning* is necessarily connected with some other substantive noun, which must be understood, if it be not expressed; as *the beginning of the year*; *the beginning of the century*; *the beginning of time*; &c. it is perfectly obvious, that the necessity of this connexion may be traced to the nature of the idea which the word *beginning* is formed to denote; and cannot be ascribed on any principle, to the unsuitness of the word *beginning*, for conveying that idea to the mind of the hearer.

FOR the word *beginning*, being a substantive noun, and therefore significant in its own right, is never unfit to convey to the mind of the hearer, the idea which it was originally formed to denote; but the word *from*, though it denotes the same idea, is unfit to convey it to the hearer's mind, unless it be followed by a substantive noun. And hence it happens, that the word *beginning* may supply the place of the word *from*, in every example that can be adduced; (See the DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY, vol. I.

page 341, et seq.) whereas the word *from* cannot supply the place of the word *beginning*, on any occasion. But if the word *from* like the word *beginning*, were truly significant in its own right, it would be quite impossible to assign any reason why either might not be used instead of both; and since we know that the word *from* cannot be so used, it may be thence inferred, with certain accuracy, that this word is not significant of the idea which it was formed to denote, in every combination that can be conceived. For the place of the word *from* may be invariably supplied by the word *beginning*, which is a clear proof that both are used in the same sense; and I ask, therefore, in what consists the difference between them if not in this, that the word *beginning* is a substantive noun, and therefore significant in every combination; whereas the word *from* (like the letter *s* of the plural number, or like the two *Alifs* in *أَقْوَال*, the plural of *قَوْل* *A speech*;) is a particle; that is to say, it is not significant in every combination, but it is significant in certain combinations; or in other words, it is significant in the right of a given substantive noun, by which it must be therefore invariably followed.

It may be inferred, therefore, that the idea signified by the word *from*, is recognised by the mind as it exists in the following substantive noun; that is to say, the mind never dwells on the sense of the word *from*, considered as a sound significant in its own right, and hastens on the contrary, to combine it with that substantive noun, on which the significance of its character always depends. Let the reader substitute the word *beginning* for the word *from*, in the following sentence; "*The lamp hangs from the ceiling,*" or "*The lamp hangs beginning the ceiling;*" and, by adverting to the manner in which these words are pronounced, he will clearly perceive a pause after the word *beginning*, which would be utterly misplaced after the word *from*. The reason is obviously this; that the meaning of the word *from* is developed by the following substantive noun; whereas the meaning of the word *beginning* is recognised by the mind as it exists in that word.

word. (*The beginning is the ceiling.*) Or to express the same sentiment in another way, the word *beginning* is a substantive noun; and therefore significant in its own right; whereas the word *from* is a particle; and therefore depends, for the significance of its character, on a given substantive noun by which it must be followed in every sentence.*

THERE is a condition, therefore, annexed to the significance of every PARTICLE, which is never applicable to that of the corresponding VERB or NOUN; and, in the existence of this condition, consists the essence of every particle; or that which serves to distinguish a particle, from either of the other two parts of speech. And hence it may be inferred, *first*, that if a word be truly significant in its own right, it can be no particle, though it may be incapable of utterance when it stands alone; and, *secondly*, that if a word be not significant in its own right, but only in the right of some one or more words with which it must be therefore invariably connected; it must be a particle, though it may be capable of utterance when it stands alone.

To explain by examples. The word FROM is a particle; because I have already shewn that this word is not significant in its own right, though it is obviously capable of utterance when it stands alone. And the CONJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS *م*, *ت*, and *ش* of the Persian language are not particles; be-

* It has been stated to me, that the word *from* is not less significant than the word *beginning*; for whether we say *the lamp hangs from*, or *the lamp hangs beginning*, the proposition is equally imperfect; and the mind of the hearer will be equally impatient to hear the name of the place, from which the lamp begins to hang, in either case. This is unquestionably true; and I shall here observe once for all, that particles properly used, are not more or less significant than nouns or verbs, properly used. The difference between them consists in a circumstance wholly foreign to this observation; *namely*, in the condition annexed to the significances of every particle. Let that condition be present in a given proposition, and the particle will be significant in that proposition: (I walked *from* London to Westminster.) Let the condition be wanting, and the particle will become an unmeaning sound. (In the *from* God created the heavens and the earth.) There is no such condition as this annexed to the significance of verbs or nouns; and these therefore will convey, in every possible proposition, the ideas which they were originally formed to denote.

cause they are truly significant in their own right, though they are not capable of utterance when they stand alone. For it must be inferred that every word is truly significant in its own right, if the contrary cannot be shewn by adverting to facts: that is to say, if the contrary cannot be shewn by adducing a specific proposition, in which a given word shall not convey the sense which it was formed to denote; and the contrary cannot be shewn in the case of the **CONJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS** of the Persian language; *First*, because these are mutually interchangeable with the **DISJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS**; as *آستبم* or *آستب من* *my Horse*; *گفتمت* or *مرا گفتم* *I said to thee*; *آوردم* or *زدمش* *I struck him*; &c. and, *Secondly*, because they retain their significance after particles, and other words, on which the significance of their character can have no dependence.

EXAMPLE.

اگرم جات بخشیش و گرم مات خواهی سیر بندگی بخدمت پیر نهیم که با دستانهای

“ **WHETHER** thou grantest me life, or desirest my death, I submit to thy will; for thou art the Lord.”

THE reader will perceive that the *conjunctive personal pronoun* *م*, which occurs twice in these lines, is added, in both cases, to the particle *اگر* *If*; and as the pronoun can have no dependence on that particle for the significance of its character; so, it would be wholly insignificant in this combination, if it were not significant in its own right. For we cannot separate the letter (s) of the plural number, from that word on which the significance of its character always depends; as *Books*; *Papers*; *Pens*; &c. but we may separate the conjunctive personal pronouns of the Persian language from any given word without exception; provided, only, that we are careful to join them to another word in the same sentence. Thus

بخشیش.

اَلْكَرْبُخَشْبَةُ حَيَاتٌ, or اَلْكَرْبُ حَيَاتٌ بِخَشْبَةٍ, or اَلْكَرْبُ حَيَاتٌ بِخَشْبَةٍ might be used with equal accuracy to signify, "If thou givest me life," and hence it is obvious, that these pronouns are truly significant in their own right; though each of them, consisting only of a single letter, is therefore incapable of utterance when it stands alone.

HAVING endeavoured to determine the general characteristic of all particles, I now proceed to observe, that it is not my intention, nor is it within the reach of my ability, to ascertain the *precise condition*, by which the significance of each particle must be restricted in our language; but I shall endeavour to furnish the reader with one general key, (indeed I have already furnished a key) by which the accuracy of my principle may, I conceive, be easily brought to the test of experiment, in every example that can be adduced. Whenever it shall happen that either of two words, denoting precisely the *same* idea, may invariably supply the place of both; it must be obvious, that these two words are exactly synonymous in every respect; but if this be true of one of them only, we are then to reconsider the question; and if it shall still appear, that the idea signified by both is precisely the *same*; we must, of necessity, infer that the other does not, in every possible combination, convey the idea which it was formed to denote; or, in other words, that the significance of the last is restricted by a certain condition (whatever it may be) which is not applicable to that of the first.

Now it fortunately happens, that most of the particles in our language have been traced to their origin by Mr. TOOKER; who has been able, by adverting to the etymology of each particle, to determine the true sense which it was formed to denote. And it is in the power of all my readers, by reversing the process which he has adopted, to ascertain the conditional significance of every particle; though it may be often a matter of considerable difficulty, to determine the *precise condition*, on which the significance of a given particle may happen to depend.

K

For

For it does not appear (and I beg the readers particular attention to this observation) that those particles of which the origin has been traced by Mr. TOOKE are now used in a sense different from that which they formerly possessed as nouns or verbs ; and, on the contrary, those obsolete nouns or verbs, which are now become particles in our language, continue still to retain their primitive sense. This fact has been clearly established by Mr. TOOKE, who has very successfully^d proved, that any given verb or noun may supply the place of the corresponding particle, in every example that can be adduced : a certain proof that the idea signified by both is, at this day, precisely the same.

I ASK therefore (and I apply the question to every particle of which the origin has been traced by him) *why the opposite proposition is not equally true?* that is to say, why a particle, denoting precisely the same idea with any given verb or noun, shall not be able to supply its place, in every example that can be adduced. And if the coincidence or unity of idea for which I contend be not fallacious ; it follows, that the inability of a particle, in any given example, to supply the place of the corresponding verb or noun, must be considered as a proof that the particle is not *significant* in that example ; or, in other words, that it does not, in every possible combination, convey the idea which it was formed to denote. But if a word be not significant under every combination, it cannot be significant in its own right ; for a word which is truly significant in its own right, has no dependence, for the significance of its character, on any combination whatever ; that is to say, it must be equally significant, under every combination that can be conceived. (Accordingly, a verb or a noun will be found to be in fact significant, in every combination that can be conceived.) And if a word be not significant in its own right, it must be wholly insignificant in every combination ; (which is not true of any particle) or it must be significant in certain combinations ; that is to say, it must be significant in the right of some one or more words, with which it must be therefore
invariably

invariably connected: and this is the true definition of a particle properly so called.

To explain by examples. The particles *for, of, from, with, if, unless, yet, still, though*; are stated, by Mr. TOOKE, to denote the same ideas signified by the words *cause, consequence, beginning, join, give, dismiss, get, put, allow*; which are nouns or verbs in the imperative mode. But the particles cannot supply the place of the corresponding verbs or nouns, in the following, and other examples of the same nature: *Tell me the cause; Beware of the consequence; Read from the beginning; Join the party; Give me a book; Dismiss the servant; Get me a chair; Put the case; Allow the fact; &c. &c. &c.* Whereas it appears, from the discoveries of Mr. TOOKE, that the nouns or verbs may supply the place of the corresponding particles, in every example that can be adduced. And, if the preceding observations be founded in truth, this circumstance alone is sufficient to determine the conditional significance of these particles; that is to say, it proves, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that they must now be assigned to the class of particles, because they are not significant in every combination; (or, in other words, because they are not significant in their own right;) and that they cannot, for the same reason, be now considered as nouns or verbs; whatever may have been their character in former times. The precise or particular condition, on which the significance of each particle may happen to depend, is indeed another question; the investigation of which must, of necessity, be left to the ingenuity of the reader; since I have neither ability nor inclination to engage in the discussion.*

IF

* I shall here take notice of an objection, (the most formidable perhaps that can be urged) against the principle which I have endeavoured to establish. It has been suggested to me by a friend, in whose judgment I have the utmost confidence, that either of two indisputable verbs or nouns, denoting precisely the same idea, may supersede the other in many of the common forms of speech. From which it is stated to follow, according to the principle which I have established, that the superseded verb or the superseded noun ought to be assigned to the class of particles; whereas they cannot, in point of fact, be accurately assigned to that class. The French adjective "latent," for example, has been superseded

I have been successful in my endeavour to establish the existence of particles in the present state of our language; and to demonstrate

needed by the corresponding adjective "caché" in every form of speech but one; namely "vices latens" concealed faults; which is an expression used to denote certain disorders with which a horse may be afflicted, without having any appearances of them. I understand that if the adjective "caché" were employed for "latent" in the preceding example, as "vices cachés," the expression would be perfectly intelligible to any Frenchman; and, on the contrary, if the adjective "latent" were used for "caché" in any other form of speech, as "il est latent" for "il est caché" *He is concealed*; it is said that the expression, in that case, would be unintelligible to most people.

I have no doubt of the fact stated in this observation; namely, that the adjective "latent" cannot be accurately employed for the adjective "caché" in the preceding example, though both denote the same idea. And something of the same kind may be observed in the use of the English adjective "latent;" for though we often talk of "latent heat," we never say of a man that *he is latent*; because the expression, though not unintelligible, would be very quaint. Now the word "latent" is not a particle; and if it be indeed true, that it must be assigned to the class of particles, according to the principle which I have endeavoured to establish, I must be compelled to admit, that the principle itself is founded in error. But I deny that the word "latent," whether considered as a French or as an English adjective, can be unintelligible in any combination whatever; though it may be now obsolete in many combinations, and may become so hereafter in every combination.

For if it were affirmed in common language that "the lamp hangs *beginning* the ceiling" such an expression would be doubtless faulty; and might be said, in some sense, to be unintelligible; because the word *from*, in the common practice of the English Language, is never superseded by the word *beginning*, in any example of this nature. It cannot however be admitted, (nor will the concession be demanded by any disciple of Mr. Tooker) that the word *beginning* is really insignificant in this example; for on the contrary, we have Mr. Tooker's authority to assert the significance of that word, as well in this example, as in many others equally remote from the common usage of the English tongue.

Now I admit that the expression "il est latent" may be so far unintelligible as to be at variance with the common usage of the French tongue; but as it cannot be shewn that the word "latent" depends for the significance of its character on any combination whatever; so, I conceive that it must be and is significant in the preceding, as well as in every other combination that can be imagined. Of a particle, on the contrary, it may be always shewn that the significance of its character depends on a certain combination; as that of the two *Alifs* in أقوال the plural of قول *A speech*. And if that combination shall happen to be absent in a given proposition, the particle will lose all significance in that proposition; just as the two *Alifs*, which indicate plurality in their combination with قول, are wholly insignificant when the word قول is taken away. I conceive therefore, according to this principle, that *In the from* is an expression as completely destitute of meaning as *In the of*; or *In the by*; or *In the with*; &c. &c. notwithstanding the fact that the word *from*, when properly used, (that is to say, when followed by a given substantive noun,) denotes the same idea signified by the word *beginning*. And the reason is obvious; namely, because the significance of the word *from* is not less dependant on its combination with the following substantive noun, than is that of the two *Alifs*, on their combination with the word قول, or any other word, of which they may be employed to form the plural number.

Let

demonstrate their dependance, for significance of character, or other words with which they must be therefore invariably connected; it will be a matter of little difficulty, to furnish arguments of considerable weight, against the admission of that doctrine which it seems to be the object of Mr. TOOKE's book to establish; *namely*, that all the particles of every language must have been originally verbs or nouns.

FOR though the fact may be true (and I have neither occasion nor ability to dispute its truth) in the case of all the English particles of which the etymology has been traced by him; it does not therefore follow, that we have any right to extend the inference by analogy, to any one particle of which the origin remains unknown. Nay, I shall venture to affirm, in direct opposition to this doctrine, that we are bound by all the principles of

Let it be shewn that the significance of the word "latent" depends on any combination of this nature, and I shall be justified in assigning that word to the class of particles; but as this cannot possibly be shewn because in fact it is not true, so, it follows, that we must of necessity admit the *selfsignificance* of that word. And of every self-significant word I have already remarked that no possible combination can destroy the significance of its character; or, in other words, that it must be significant in every combination that can be conceived; from which it follows, that "it is latent" *is* and *must be* an intelligible expression; though it may be also true, that a good writer would refrain from its adoption, adverting to the common usage of the French tongue.

The preceding arguments appear to me to be quite conclusive, unless it shall be maintained that *In the from* is not less intelligible than "it is latent;" first, because *from* signifies the *beginnings*; and secondly, because *In the beginning* is clearly the member of an intelligible sentence. I cannot answer this argument otherwise than by a simple denial of the fact. If it be true that the word *from*, like the word *beginning*, is truly significant in its own right; the argument is doubtless unanswerable; and the distinction between the noun and the particle must of necessity fall to the ground. But I have endeavoured to demonstrate the reality of this distinction, as well in the case of the word *from*, as in the case of many other words; and it is incumbent on those who deny its existence, to support their opinions by arguments drawn from existing tongues. How they will be able to do this I am not prepared to anticipate, because the position appears to me to be at variance with the usage of every tongue. I shall therefore only remark, (what indeed I have remarked already) that it will be of no consequence to shew that the word *from*, (or any other particle) being a verb or a noun among the Anglo-Saxons, was *once* significant in its own right; because I have never denied that any given particle *may* have been formerly a verb or a noun. The present question relates merely to the *existing* difference between all those words which are *now* particles, as opposed to others which are nouns or verbs; and this difference having, as I conceive, been fully established in the preceding part of this chapter, it remains to be shewn in the sequel, how little reason there is to believe that every particle *must* have been formerly a verb or a noun.

L

just

Just reasoning, to believe every particle to have possessed formerly and at all times the same character which it now possesses; unless the contrary can be shewn by adverting to facts. For there is nothing in the nature of any one particle, which can lead (as a matter of necessity) to such an inference in the case of another; and it seems to me, indeed, that the deduction by analogy is not much more tenable than it would be, to maintain that all the *sailors* in the world were formerly *soldiers*; because the fact may be true in many cases.

AND accordingly, if it be asked why the letter *s* of the plural number must have possessed formerly a character different from that which it now possesses; or, in other words, why the letter *s* must have been formerly a verb or a noun; the question of *necessity* must be instantly relinquished, because it is wholly untenable on any principle: and unless the fact can be established by adverting to evidence, it will then remain to be considered, what reason there is for its admission on the ground of probability alone. But here, also, the advocate of Mr. TOOKE's principles may be opposed by arguments much more cogent than convenient for his purpose; for the whole system of ARABIC INFLEXION, and more especially the formation of the plural number, presents a series of obstacles to the admission of his principles; which no etymologist will undertake to remove. Let it be admitted (as it cannot surely be denied) that the two *Alifs*, in اَقْوَال the plural of قَوْل *A speech*, were never significant of plurality in their own right; and it follows directly from this admission, that we have no right to assume the self significance of the letter *s*; unless we are prepared to prove the fact. And so, also, if it be granted that there is no word or sound self significant of plurality, in كُتُب the plural of كِتَاب *A book*, the same inference will follow of course.

IN short, it is only necessary to direct the reader's attention to the *whole structure of the Arabic Language*, considered with reference

ference to that of the English, or of any other tongue; and if he shall find, (as he must find) that the office of our terminations is performed among the Arabs by various letters, which intersect the radical in all its points, (as *مُشَقّ* in *الْمُشَقّ* *A lover*; *مُؤَمِّم* and *مُؤَمِّق* in *مُعَشِّق* *Beloved*; &c. &c. &c.) he will then be sufficiently indisposed to admit, without positive evidence of the fact, that any given termination (such as *er* in *lover*, or *ed* in *loved*) *must* have been formerly a verb, or a noun.

It may be inferred therefore, that Mr. TOOKE was mistaken when (having occasion to speak of the particle *so*, and of those terminations which mark the infinitive in most of the European tongues) he stated his opinion that "all these terminations may be traced to their respective origin; and that, however artificial they may now appear to us, they were not, originally, the effect of premeditated and deliberate art; but separate words, by length of time corrupted, and confesing with the words of which they are now considered as the *terminations*". (See *DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY*, vol. I, page 352.) For, if one termination shall be, indeed, the effect of premeditated and deliberate art; it is obvious that another may be so too; and, so long as the contrary cannot be shewn by adverting to facts, we have a right to assume, (nay we are bound to assume) that every given termination is the effect of premeditated and deliberate art; unless it can be shewn that art has nothing to do in the structure of language.

BUT the principles of Arabic inflexion appear to me, to evince beyond the possibility of doubt, that art has a great deal to do in the structure of *that* language; and therefore, in all probability, of every other: for how can we account for the existence of the words فَيْلٌ or قِيَاتٌ Excellence; and of its derivatives مَفْئَلٌ، اِفْتِئَالٌ، اِتْفِئَالٌ، اِنْقِئَالٌ، اُفْقِئَالٌ، اِنْقِئَالٌ، اِغْفِئَالٌ، اِنْغِئَالٌ، &c. &c. &c. without having recourse to the aid of art! It may be surely assumed, (if there
be

be any certainty in human reason) that the very artificial structure of these derivatives cannot be ascribed to the progress of corruption, by the most determined etymologist that ever existed; and if any one of them, as *فَافِل* for example, shall be truly the result of deliberate art; how can we be assured that art has no share in the structure of our own more simple tongue?

THE discovery of a language devoid of art would, indeed, be anomalous in the history of the human mind; since it may be affirmed, that such a language, proceeding on no fixed principles whatever, would be wholly independent on the rules of Grammar. But no such language will be ever discovered; because the structure of every tongue must be determined by the reason (not the caprice) of the inventors; and the form of any given derivative, whether it be a verb or a noun, being fixed at first by accident alone, will infallibly serve as a precedent, to determine that of many others. The only question to be considered consists, therefore, not in the introduction of art into the structure of language; for of that, there cannot be the smallest doubt; but merely, in the truth or falshood of the following proposition; *namely*, whether the inventors of a given language *did* or *did not* possess the skill necessary to invent primitive particles, which were not originally verbs or nouns. And, as the structure of the Arabic Language evinces the most consummate art and skill; (for what system of inflexion can be more comprehensive, or more admirably adapted to the purposes of speech than that of Arabia?) so, it is a satire on the judgment of other nations, to decide this question in the negative; and to ascribe every useful contrivance of language, not to the *ingenuity* of the inventors; but merely to the progress of corruption alone*.

AND,

* It is particularly remarkable of Mr. Tooke's system, that though he admits the introduction of particles to be an improvement in Language, (comparing a Language without particles to a cart without wheels) he demands our unqualified assent to his proposition, *that the use of them must be every where traced to the progress of corruption*; or, in other words, that all particles are corrupted verbs or nouns: as if the invention of a primitive

AND, if it be considered that the most important improvements in the machinery now employed in various manufactures, have been the invention, not of philosophers but of *common workmen*; possessed of no theoretical knowledge whatever, but merely of that practical skill resulting from the occupations in which they were daily engaged; (See *WEALTH OF NATIONS*, vol. I, page 16,) it will not be deemed incredible that men, living in the rudest age, might yet be capable, by their ingenuity, of improving Language. For every Language may be considered as a great *machine*; in the use of which those who speak it, (however deficient in theory,) have acquired a considerable degree of practical skill; and as their thoughts must be naturally turned to its improvement, because every man desires to express his sentiments in the shortest possible way; so, they might easily hit on primitive particles, (as the letters of the plural number) which were not originally verbs or nouns,

THAT such particles have been invented, is not, however, a matter of conjecture; for if the structure of the Arabic Language shall not be explained in a manner consistent with the principles of Mr. TOOKER, it follows that his principles are not accurately applicable to every tongue; and we shall then be furnished with a sufficient motive for doubting the accuracy of their application to all the particles of *any* given Language; unless the fact shall be proved, in the case of each particle, by deducing its origin from a verb or a noun. That the fact has been very fully proved by Mr. TOOKER, in the case of many English particles, is indeed a proposition which cannot be denied; but there is yet much to be done, before the non-existence of primitive particles in the English Language can be certainly affirmed; and, as a principle of

primitive particle were an effort of ingenuity above the reach of the human mind. I believe, on the contrary, that primitive particles are common to every tongue; and that no language can exist long, before their obvious utility will suggest their invention. They will not indeed be numerous in a barbarous tongue, because particles, whether primitive or derivative, are not numerous in any tongue; and because they must be expected (like the nouns and the verbs) to be much less numerous in a barbarous than they are in a polished Language.

It does not however follow, of necessity, that the meaning of a primitive particle cannot be discovered in any way ; and, on the contrary, I am disposed to believe that the opposition of sense in certain particles, (such as *to* and *from*) and, generally speaking, the application of every particle by the best writers in our own language, will furnish a sufficient criterion to guide our judgment, in fixing the sense which it was formed to denote. For Mr. TOOKE has ascertained the true sense of the definite article *the* which is doubtless a particle ; (and, so far as I know, a primitive particle ; since I am not aware that it was formerly a verb or a noun among the Anglo-Saxons) without having recourse to the aid of etymology ; and so also, the Arabian Grammarians have discovered the particles *من* *From*, and *إلى* *To*, to be synonymous in point of sense, with *ابتداء* *The beginning*, and *انتهاء* *The end* ; though they are not at all connected with these words, in point of etymology.

It must be admitted, however, that many Arabic and Persian particles are supposed to convey more than one idea ; and if it be true, as Mr. TOOKE seems to believe, that every word denotes invariably the same idea, in every example that can be adduced ; it must then be inferred, that the Arabs, like the English, have often mistaken the meaning of their own particles. But I have endeavoured, on a former occasion, to shew that any given verb or noun may denote more than one idea ; (See Note, page 388) and if the principle there explained be accurately applicable to nouns and verbs, it will be quite impossible to assign any reason why its application may not be extended to particles also. In this case, the Arabian Grammarians may possibly be in the right, when they assign more than one sense to most of their particles.

It only remains to be remarked, that certain reputed prepositions, such as *Before* and *After*, *Within*, *Without*, *Between*, *Behind*, *Above*, *Below*, *Up* and *Down*, *Among*, *Over*, *Under*, *Near*,
and

and perhaps many others, cannot be accurately assigned to the class of particles, according to the principle which I have endeavoured to establish, because they are truly significant in their own right. These nouns denote, not indeed the names of any specific or positive time or place; but like the words *front*, *rear*, &c. they are invariably the names of a given time, or a given place, considered with reference to some other time or place. Thus the word *above* is the name of any given place, which is higher than some other place present to the mind of the speaker who employs that word; and so, also, the word *before* is the name of any given time or place, preceding another time, or another place, which is signified by the word *after*, or the word *behind*. Accordingly, the corresponding terms in the Persian Language, as *بالا* *Above*, *زیر* *Below*, *پیش* *Before*, *پس* *Behind*, or *After*, *اندرون* *Within*, *بیرون* *Without*, *میان* *The middle*, or *Between*, *نزد* *Near*, &c. &c. are assigned to that class of nouns which is known to Grammarians by the term *ظروف*.

AND, in the Persian Language, they are invariably followed by the *اضافات*, or that particle which marks the second of two substantive nouns to be in the genitive case; a circumstance in which they differ from the corresponding terms in the English Language, which do not generally (though some of them do occasionally) govern the following substantive nouns in the genitive case. Examples: *بالای آسمان* *Above (of) the Heavens*; *زیر زمین* *Under (of) the Earth*; *پیش قاضی* *Before (of) the Judge*; *پس خانه* *Behind (of) the House*; *اندرون مسجد* *Within (of) the Temple*; *بیرون شهر* *Without (of) the City*; *میان تشکریان* *Amidst (of) the Soldiers*; *نزد حق* *Near (of) God*; or *In the sight of God*; &c. &c. &c.

IN common with all other nouns of the class termed *ظروف*, the preposition which ought to govern these nouns is commonly omitted; but it may be accurately expressed after most of them; and

N

perhaps

perhaps after them all. Examples : *بَرَاءُ لِي السَّمَانِ* Above or On the top of the Heavens ; *بَرَزِيرُ زَمِينِ* Below or In the under part of the Earth ; *دَرْ پِشِ قاضی* Before or In front of the Judge ; *دَرْ پِشِ خانَه* Behind or In the rear of the House, &c. So, also, the preposition which ought to govern any other *ظَرْف* is very often omitted ; as *بَرْوَزِ قِیامت* or *رُوزِ قِیامت* On the Day of Judgment ; *شبِ مِعراج* or *بِشَبِ مِعراج* On the night of the Ascension ; (MOHUMMUD's ascension into Heaven on the beast *بُرَاق* ; &c. &c. &c.)

As these reputed prepositions have been assigned to the class of nouns, so the substantive verb *اُست* Is, together with the vowel *Kufra*, and the letter *ن*, (which were anciently used in the sense of the substantive verb,) have been assigned to the class of particles, by the Grammarians of Persia. For the word *است* denotes, merely, that relation which exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition ; as *زَیْدِ نیکِ است* ZYDE is good ; *اَمَرِ خوشِ است* AMR is happy ; &c. and is not, like our substantive verb, or like the Persian substantive verb *هست*, significant of *existence* when it stands alone. So, also, the vowel *کِره* and the letter *ن*, when joined to the end of the predicate of a given proposition, were anciently significant of the same relation ; as *نیکِ ن* He is good ; *خوشِ ن* He is happy ; *زَیْدِ وِ بَیْرِ* ZYDE is a writer ; &c. But they have long become obsolete in that sense, and the memory of their occurrence is no where preserved, but in the prefatory dissertations of certain Lexicographers. It seems to me, however, that if the vowel *کِره* and the letter *ن* be truly particles when thus used, the substantive verb must be also a particle, of that species which is known to Grammarians by the term *رَوایط* or *Connectives*.

BEING ignorant of the sources of the Arabic and Persian Tongues, I am wholly unqualified to trace the corruptions that may have crept into these tongues in the course of time ; and cannot, therefore,

therefore, hazard an opinion on the probable success of any future etymologist, who shall undertake to account for the Arabic and Persian particles, on the principles of Mr. Tooke. That many of these particles may have been formerly verbs or nouns, is indeed very possible; but I cannot stimulate enquiry by the production of any examples deserving of notice. The following have occurred, I believe, to most of the admirers of Mr. Tooke's system, who know any thing of the Persian Tongue: *دَر* *A door*; *دَر* *In*; *طی* *Upon*; *بلو* *Heights*; *بَر* *The bosom*; *بَر* *Near*; and also *بَر* *Upon*; *اگر* *If*; *بگیر* *Grant*; or *Allow*; *آمرأه* *A fellow traveller*; *آمرأه* *With*; *آنچه* *Although*; compounded of *چه* *What* ? and *اگر* *If*; &c.

It is to be observed, however, *first*, that *اگر* is itself a contraction of *اگر*; *secondly*, that *الف* cannot be introduced into the imperative *اگر*; *thirdly*, that the letter *یا*, so far as I know, was never introduced into the particle *اگر*; and *finally*, that *اگر* with *کسر*, not *اگر* with *فتحه*, seems to be the most natural and analogous contraction of *اگر*. I think it doubtful, therefore, whether the particle *اگر* is at all connected with the imperative *اگر*. It may be also observed, that *آمرأه* is not at this day a preposition, but a compounded substantive noun; and that *بَر* is not a preposition when it signifies *Near*. Accordingly, these nouns require to be invariably followed by the *اضافه* as *آمرأه من* *With me*; *بَر من* *Near me*; &c. The word *بَر* is supposed to be a preposition when it signifies *On*, or *Upon*; and does not, in this case, admit the *اضافه*. Example: *برآشپ سوار است* *He is mounted on horseback*; &c. There may be other examples, besides those which I have now detailed, but they do not, at present, occur to my recollection; and it would be a waste of time to look for them, because I am certain that Mr. Tooke's principles have never been successfully applied to the Arabic or the Persian Tongue.

PLAN

PLAN OF THE SYNTAX:

THE science of Grammar is every where divided into the two branches of INFLEXION and SYNTAX ; the first treating of the *formation* of words ; and the second, of their *application* to the purposes of speech. The materials of both are precisely the same ; but the object, to be accomplished, is obviously different in either case. It is the business of INFLEXION to arrange, in their proper order, every class of words that may happen to enter into the composition of a given Language ; to define the specific difference existing between them ; and to detail the rules applicable to the formation of each class. It is the business of SYNTAX to consider, in the same order, the application of these words to the purposes of speech.

IN a Grammar perfectly regular, every chapter of inflexion would be therefore accompanied by a corresponding chapter of syntax ; *first*, because the definition or the formation of any given class of words, whether primitive or derivative, might furnish matter for a chapter of inflexion ; and, *secondly*, because the application of the same class, to the purposes of speech, might furnish matter for a chapter of syntax. But there is not any such thing as a perfectly regular Grammar in any Language ; and the imperfections incident to every tongue, as well as the advantages of brevity, and other causes, have universally occasioned the adoption of various arrangements, wholly different, and much less perfect in their own nature, than that to which I have now adverted.

FOR every Grammar, though it were otherwise perfect, must yet partake of those theoretical defects, which are incident to the structure of the Language of which it treats ; and if it happens (as in the Persian Language and perhaps in most others) that the operation of general principles is often superseded by the occurrence of particular exceptions, it will then be very difficult, though

though not wholly impossible, to preserve a clear and perspicuous arrangement, in detailing the rules of inflexion or syntax that may happen to be applicable to that Language. For, on the one hand, the same rule of inflexion will be often applicable to the formation of various nouns essentially differing from each other in their own nature; as *كَرْدَار* *AElion*; *خَرِيدَار* *A purchaser*; *مُشْتَار* *Slain*; &c. &c. &c. and, on the other hand, opposite rules will be often applicable to the formation of various nouns of the same class; as *نَيْبِي* *Goodness*; *رُنج* *Sorrow*; *تبش* *Fever*; and other examples of that nature.

AND hence it follows, that either of two arrangements are offered to the choice of every Grammarian, who has occasion to treat the inflexion of such a language. For on the one hand he may comprise, in the same chapter, every word which is formed by the application of the same rule; and in this case a great variety of nouns, essentially differing from each other in their own nature, will be often jumbled together in that chapter; or on the other hand he may treat, in the same chapter, of every word which belongs by signification to the same class; and in this case he must repeat every rule, as often as it may be applicable to words which are not, by signification, of the same class.

THE first arrangement appears to me to be the worst; because it has an obvious tendency to confound together two or more words which belong, by signification, to opposite classes; and of which, therefore, the application to the purposes of speech cannot be the same. And, in a Grammar written on that plan, it will be wholly impossible to preserve any connexion, or unity of design, between the inflexion and the syntax of a given language; because the classification of every word is determined, in the syntax, not by the arbitrary rules which guide its formation; but merely by the *sense* which it may happen to denote.

THE last arrangement is that which I have adopted in treating of the formation of Arabic and Persian nouns ; and the following are the reasons which determined my choice. *First*, the structure of the Arabic Language naturally suggests the adoption of this plan, which has been chosen, accordingly, by all the Grammarians who have had occasion to treat of that language : *Secondly*, a clear and perspicuous arrangement of all the nouns, which enter into the composition of every Tongue, might be formed according to this plan, because it admits of no criterion, to determine the proper classification of every word, but that of the sense which it may happen to denote : *Thirdly*, the structure of the Persian or of any other language cannot, therefore, present any obstacles to the universal adoption of this plan : *Fourthly*, it is the duty of every Grammarian, to arrange into classes the words of which he has occasion to treat ; and to assign to the same class every word, however formed, which is essentially the same in its nature and character : *Fifthly*, if this plan shall not be adopted in treating of inflexion, it must yet be adopted in treating of syntax ; because the just application of words to the purposes of speech constitutes the true and proper end of syntax ; which does not, therefore, recognise any distinction between two or more words, but that which depends on the difference of their nature ; that is to say, on the nature of the various ideas which they are formed to denote : *Sixthly*, it can be charged with no inconvenience but that which I have mentioned ; *namely*, the necessity of repeating the same rule as often as it may be applicable to the formation of two or more words which are not, by signification, of the same class : and, *finally*, its general adoption would introduce into all the Grammars in the world that unity of plan, which ought, in my opinion, to pervade them all.

BUT though I have generally endeavoured to assign to the same class every word which is essentially the same in its nature and character ; I have not thought it necessary to *complete* the plan, by
 admitting

admitting into the system of inflexion, *every class of words without exception*, which enters into the composition of the Persian Tongue. On the contrary, the primitive NOUNS, PRONOUNS, and PARTICLES, of the Persian Language, have been wholly omitted; *first*, because the formation of these words admits of no illustration by the rules of Grammar; and, *secondly*, because it follows, that their application to the purposes of speech, which is a matter of syntax, forms the only reasonable object of Grammatical enquiry.

THE plan which I intend to pursue in treating the syntax, will be nearly the same with that which I have followed in treating the inflexion of the Persian Tongue: that is to say, I shall select a certain class of words (such as the pronouns for example) to form the subject of a given chapter; and having detailed the rules which may appear to regulate their application to the purposes of speech, I shall then proceed to another class; and so on, through most of the *مفردات* or *Single words*, whether NOUNS, VERBS, or PARTICLES, that enter into the composition of the Persian Tongue.

THE absolute completion of this part of the plan would leave nothing to be considered in the second or third parts, into which I intend to divide the syntax: but it must be obvious, that certain combinations, such as that of *two substantive nouns*, or of a *substantive followed by an adjective noun*, require to be considered in separate chapters. The second part of the syntax will therefore treat of those IMPERFECT COMBINATIONS, (*مترکبات ناقصه*) which do not form a complete or perfect sentence; and the third part will treat of the *مترکبات تامه* that is to say, of those combinations which form A COMPLETE AND PERFECT SENTENCE.

It only remains to be stated, that the plan of the syntax, like that of the inflexion, will not require me to notice every class

class of words, without exception, which enter into the composition of the Persian Tongue. On the contrary, I reserve to myself the option of omitting entirely all those words, of which the application, to the purposes of speech, shall seem to be incapable of illustration by the rules of Grammar. And, on the other hand, I shall not scruple to point out those defects, in the execution of my plan, which may occur to my notice in the course of its progress: for the syntax of the Persian Language has not been hitherto successfully treated by any Grammarian of Europe or Asia; and as I cannot expect to be every way fortunate in the completion of a work, which has baffled the industry of all my predecessors; so, I shall not be ashamed to own the cases, in which it may appear to myself, that matter of enquiry is left for those who shall follow hereafter in the same tract.

COMPOSITION AND DIVISION OF SENTENCES.

A SENTENCE has been defined, by the Persian Grammarians to be *a combination of words, so arranged, as to convey some information to the mind of the hearer.* Every sentence may be followed, therefore, by the silence of the speaker, since it must comprise in itself, all that is essential to its intelligible character. The words *مُرْتَبِ نَام*, *مُرْتَبِ اسْتَاذِي*, *جُمْلَه*, *كَلَام*, are indifferently used to signify *a sentence*; but the word *جُمْلَه* may also signify *The member of any compounded sentence, comprising, within itself, the three terms of a given proposition*; whereas the word *كَلَام* cannot be applied to any part of a sentence, whether simple or compounded, which is less than the whole. Thus, if it be affirmed of an individual that "He follows the same profession which his father followed," the term *جُمْلَه* will be separately applicable to either member of the sentence, or jointly applicable to both members; and the term *كَلَام* will be applicable to both, but cannot be applied to either member.

And

And in the event of the occurrence of a copulative conjunction, as "The judge condemned the criminal and his accomplices in guilt," the term *جمله*, like the term *كلام*, will not be applicable to any part of the sentence which is less than the whole; unless the verb (condemned) be repeated in the second member of the sentence: in which case, both terms will be applicable to each member.*

It follows, from the preceding definition of the term *جمله*, that this term must be applicable to any given substantive noun in the vocative case; as "O my father," "O my brother," &c. or to an oath; as *والله*, in the words *والله لأفعلن كذا* By God I will certainly do so and so; and it is so applied, accordingly, by the Persian Grammarians. For the use of the vocative might be superseded in speech, by adopting instead of it the verb *To call*; followed by a given substantive noun; as "O my brother," "I call my brother," "O my father," "I call my father," &c. And an oath requires to be accompanied by the verb *I swear*; which is invariably understood if it be not expressed; as *والله* or *أقسم بالله* I swear by God, and other examples of the same nature. It is obvious, therefore, that an oath, or a substantive noun in the vocative case, or either of the words YES or NO, which supply the place of a perfect sentence, comprises virtually, though not verbally, the three terms of a proposition; and there is nothing else but this necessary to constitute a *جمله* as already explained. The term sen-

* When the verb is repeated, the Persian Grammarians say that the conjunction and is employed to join together two propositions; namely, "The judge condemned the criminal," "The judge condemned his accomplices." This is termed *عطف جمله بر جمله* or *The junction of two sentences*; to each of which the term *كلام* will be obviously applicable. When the verb is not repeated, they say that the same conjunction is employed to join together the two substantive nouns; namely, *the criminal*; and *his accomplices*. This is termed *عطف مفرد بر مفرد*; and the whole together will form, in that case, but a single sentence.

tence will be used hereafter in the same sense with the term **مُسَمَّ**; but I shall distinguish, in every necessary case, the difference between a perfect complex sentence, and the various perfect members or propositions of which it is composed.

It has already been stated that every sentence must, virtually or verbally, comprise in itself the three terms of a proposition; as **زید آمد** ZYDE came; **آمر نویسنده است** AMR is a writer; &c. THE SUBJECT of the proposition is termed **مُسَمَّ** or **مُسَمَّ**; or **مُسَمَّ** or **مُسَمَّ**; as opposed to THE PREDICATE, which is termed **خبر** or **مُسَمَّ** or **مُسَمَّ** or **مُسَمَّ**. The relation existing between them is known by the terms **نسبت ايجابية**, when it happens to be affirmative; or **نسبت سلبية**, when it happens to be negative; as **زید آمد لیکن آمر نیامد** ZYDE came, but AMR did not come. If the three terms of the proposition be verbally expressed, (the predicate not being an active, a passive, or a neuter verb) they will consist of the **مُسَمَّ** or *Subject of the proposition*; the **خبر** or *Predicate of the proposition*; and the **رابط** or *Mark of connexion*: as **زید نویسنده است** ZYDE is a writer; &c. But if the predicate be a neuter verb or a transitive verb in the active or passive voice, it will then be termed **فعل مجهول** or **فعل معروف**; and the subject will be termed **مفعول مالم بسم فاعله** or **فاعل**; that is to say, *the nominative to an active, or a passive verb*. Examples: **زید آمد** ZYDE came; **آمر کشته شد** AMR was killed; &c.

If a given sentence shall convey an assertion, it must be open to the suspicion of truth and falsehood; that is to say, it may be affirmed to be partly or wholly true or false; because every assertion must, by its very nature, be partly or wholly true or false. A sentence of this class is termed **جمله خبریه** or *An assertive sentence*, by the Persian Grammarians; as **زید نویسنده است** ZYDE is

is a writer, &c. And, if a given sentence shall not convey an assertion, it must convey an intreaty, a prayer, a command, &c. and will be consequently formed by a verb in the imperative or precativè modes; as when we say to a servant, *Be honest; sober; diligent; virtuous*; and other examples of the same nature. A sentence of this class will not be open to the suspicion of truth and falshood, because there is nothing affirmed to be true or false. On the contrary, the speaker commands or desires the *creation or existence of a new attribute*, (as sobriety, honesty, diligence, or virtue,) in the mind of his servant; and as he asserts nothing but his own desire, so his own desire is not directly *asserted*, in the strict and proper sense of the term; *first*, because every assertion may be affirmed to be partly or wholly true or false; and, *secondly*, because we cannot affirm the truth or falshood of any sentence which is formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode. A sentence of this class is known to the Persian Grammarians by the term *جمله انشائية* or *A creative sentence**.

THE Persian Grammarians have divided every sentence, whether simple or complex, into four classes. The first class is termed *جمله فعلية*, or THE VERBAL SENTENCE; because the predicate, in this class, must be always a verb. Example: *روز عید آمد و شهر رمضان رفت*, *The festival of the Ede is arrived; and the month of Ramazaun has passed away; &c.* The second

* When we say to a servant, "I desire you to bring me a glass of water," we directly assert our own desire; "My desire is that you shall bring me a glass of water" and it might no doubt be impertinent, but it would not be inaccurate, on the part of the servant, to reply by admitting the truth of the assertion; "I admit your desire to be such as you have stated."

This, therefore, is a *جمله خبرية*; and it conveys a *command*, not directly, but only by implication; that is to say, because it is the duty of a servant, to accomplish our desires, as soon as he knows what they are. A true command can only be answered by stating our intention to resist or to obey it; and hence, it would be absurd in the servant to answer "granted" or "I admit the fact" to his master who addressed him in the imperative mode. I should have thought it unnecessary to say a word on this subject, which is so clear in itself, had it not been affirmed by certain Grammarians, that every sentence conveys an assertion, even though it may be formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode.

class

class is termed **جمله اسمیه**, or THE NOMINAL SENTENCE ; because the predicate, in this class, must be always a noun. Examples: **زید نویسنده است** *ZYDE is a writer* ; **زید خواننده است** *ZYDE is a reader* ; &c. The third class is termed **جمله ظرفیه** because the predicate, in this class, must be a **ظرف** or NOUN OF TIME OR PLACE ; as **ترید من آن کس است** *Such a man is near me* ; or *with me* ; &c. And the fourth class is termed **جمله شرطیه** OF THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE ; because it must be composed of two members ; namely, the **شرط** or CONDITIONAL MEMBER ; and the **جسرا** which denotes the consequence arising from the **شرط**. Example: **اگر نیت خود نیک داری بی شک مقبول کسب را کردی** *If you preserve pure and virtuous intentions, you will certainly be accepted in the sight of God*. It must be obvious that this four-fold division is founded, merely, on motives of convenience ; and that all sentences are essentially the same in their nature and character ; because every sentence must virtually or verbally comprise in itself the three terms of a proposition ; however these terms may happen to be expressed.

THE following terms are commonly employed, by the Persian Grammarians, to distinguish the purpose for which a given sentence may happen to occur on a specific occasion.

جمله مسبیه

THIS term is applicable to any given sentence, that may be used to dispel the obscurity or doubt, resting on some other sentence immediately prefixed to it. Thus HAFIZ tells his mistress that " She is rich (in charms,) that he is a proper object of her charity, " and that she must grant the alms due on her beauty, " that is to say, " that she must be favourable to him." The following are the lines to which I allude, and the **جمله مسبیه** is comprised in the last proposition which is obviously employed to explain what is meant

meant by the preceding proposition, namely, "granting the alms
" due on her beauty."

تَوَصَّاهُ بِنَعْمَتِي مَنْ مَثَرَتْ نَفْسُهُ زَكَاتِ حُسْنِ وَهْ خُوشِ دَارِ مَرَامِشَبِ
جمله متبرعه

THIS term is applicable to every parenthetical sentence ; that is to say, it is applicable to every sentence, which might be altogether excluded, without injury to the sense of the context. Prayers, whether good or evil, as *عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام* *On him be peace* ; *لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ* *The curse of God be upon him* ; &c. must be generally assigned to this class.

EXAMPLE.

مَطِيرِي دُورِ اَزِينِ بَخْتِه سَرَا کَس دُوبَارَش نَدِيدِه دَر بَلَاغِ
سعدی

" A VILE musician (may he never enter this happy dwelling)
" who was never seen twice in the same house."

جمله متبرعه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence which denotes the cause of a preceding observation.

EXAMPLE.

نَبَايَدِ بَشَنِ اَتَدَرِ چِزُو کَسِ دِلِ کِه دِلِ بَرَدَاتَنِ کَارِ بَسْتِ مُشْکِلِ
سعدی

" SET not your affections on men and things, for it is not easy
" to call them off."

جمله مستأنف

THIS term is applicable to every sentence which replies, by anticipation, to a *سؤال مقدر*, that is to say, to an expected objection, or an expected censure, occurring to the mind of the writer himself. Thus HAFIZ, having spoken much of his attachment to love and wine, anticipates the censure of his pious countrymen, and guards against it, in the *جمله مستأنف*, by having recourse to the shield of predestination.

حافظ بخود پند این خرقه می آلود ای شیخ پاکدامن مژدور دارا را

“ SPARE your censures and hold me guiltless, O you, who
“ boast of spotless purity ; for it is not of his own will, (but
“ by the decrees of fate) that HAFIZ has assumed these wine
“ stained garments.”

جمله نتیجه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence, comprising a given deduction, which follows from stated preliminary observations or facts. Thus سعدی, having assigned some reasons why the poor have it not so much in their power as the rich to perform the exercises prescribed by religion, proceeds to infer, in the *جمله نتیجه*, that the devotion of the rich being more perfect, must be more acceptable in the sight of GOD.
 پس عبادت ایشان بمحفل قبول نزدیک تر است که جمیع اندو حاضر
 نه بریشان و هر آنگده خاطر

It is just to state, that the argument with regard to the relative merit of the devotion of the rich and of the poor, is carried on between two disputants, and that the preceding deduction is drawn by one of them, in support of his own theory.

جمله مقطوعه

جمله مقطوعه

THIS term is applicable to those unconnected sentences, which detail the contents of a following chapter: as **بَابِ اَوَّلِ دَرْ سِيرَتِ** &c. **وَبَابِ دُوُمِ دَرْ اَخْلَاقِ دَرْوِشَانِ** : **بِهَادِشَانِ**

جمله حالیه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence, which describes the state of the agent or the object of a verb. Thus a poet, having assumed that he is dead of grief for the unkind usage of his mistress, describes himself, (in the **جمله حالیه**) as still filled with commiseration for the state of the living, who suffer under the same tyranny which had been fatal to him.

مردم و برزند گاهم رستم می آید که تو شو بآن پیدا دما داری که باما کرده

“ DEAD as I am, yet I feel commiseration for the state of the
“ living; since you are still disposed to exercise on others the
“ same cruelty which you practised on me.”

THE hyperbole comprised in these lines is not very uncommon, even in our Language; for we are accustomed to say of a man who has received a fatal wound, (and he may say it of himself) that “ He is a dead man.” It is true indeed that the wounds of love to which the poet alludes are seldom fatal; but the love of the Persian Poets is generally nothing more or less, in my opinion, than a very ardent species of devotion; however singular the expression of this sentiment, so seemingly inconsistent with the Language of the Poets themselves, may now appear to the European reader.

جمله معطوفه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence which is connected with the preceding by a copulative conjunction. Example:
ارادت

ارادیت همچون یکی را از تخت شاهی فرود آرد و دیگری را در شکم ماهی بگذارد
 "The divine will precipitates one man from his throne; and
 "preserves another, even in the belly of a whale." A sentence
 occurring at the beginning of a discourse is termed *مبتدأ*.

I NOW proceed to consider the application of the *مفردات* or
Single words; whether NOUNS; VERBS; OR PARTICLES; which
 enter into the composition of the Persian tongue. Among these,
 the pronouns shall be first noticed, because they have been wholly
 omitted in treating of inflexion.

مفردات

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS are known, in Persian Grammar, by
 the term *ضمایر*, the plural of *ضمیر* A pronoun; or, literally, *Concealed*.
 They are said to be *concealed*; because they have invariably a
 reference to common nouns without which they would be unintel-
 ligible. They are thought to be one species of substantive nouns;
 and may be, therefore, accurately distinguished by the terms
اسمای ضمیر or *اسمای مضممر* The *concealed nouns*; as opposed to an
اسم ظاهر; which is a term applicable to common nouns.

A PRONOUN is defined to be *the substitute of a noun*; from
 which it follows, that the use of either generally (but not inva-
 riably as we shall see in the sequel) supercedes that of
 the other: or, in other words, that there can be seldom any ne-
 cessity for employing both at the same time. The pronouns of
 the first, second, and third person, are distinguished by the terms
ضمیر من, *ضمیر تو*, and *ضمیر او*; and the noun, to
 which a given pronoun may happen to refer, is termed its *مرجع*
 or *Place of reference*. THE

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS of the Persian Language are of two kinds; *first*, the ضایر متصل or CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS; which cannot be uttered when they stand alone; and, *secondly*, the ضایر منفصل or DISJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS; which may be uttered when they stand alone. The disjunctive pronouns will be considered hereafter; and I now proceed to consider the conjunctive pronouns of the Persian tongue.

AMONG these, are commonly reckoned the terminations used to vary the inflexions of a Persian verb; namely, دیدم زی دم دیدند as آمدند as آمدی دیدیم دیدند as آمدی دیدیم. The third person singular, as آمد, is supposed to be destitute of any pronoun. If the reader shall be disposed to adopt the opinion of those who assert the pronominal character of these terminations, he may support his theory by certain facts, (such as the repeated omission of م in the following example) which ought, perhaps, to decide the question in his favor.

القصه باز بشنوم و آمد بخانه زود در باز کرد و باز بست از بس استوار
انوری

“ IN short I returned, and speedily reached the house; I opened
“ the door, and afterwards firmly shut it again.”

IT is not probable that the letter م would be omitted after the verbs آمد, کرد, and بست, which are here used for آمدم, کردم, and بستم, unless that letter were truly a pronoun; and so also, by analogy, of all the rest. But as the examples of this kind are of rare occurrence in the Persian language; and as the preceding pronouns or terminations must coalesce with the verb, in almost every example that can be adduced; so, it is wholly unnecessary to consider their application to the purposes of speech; because the use of them is obviously incapable of illustration

tion by the rules of Grammar.* I proceed, therefore, to a more important class of the conjunctive personal pronouns of the Persian Language.

CONJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

FIRST PERSONAL PRONOUN.		SECOND PERSONAL PRONOUN.		THIRD PERSONAL PRONOUN.	
<i>Singular.</i>	م	<i>Singular.</i>	ت	<i>Singular.</i>	ش
<i>Plural.</i>	مان	<i>Plural.</i>	تان	<i>Plural.</i>	شان

THESE pronouns, with the exception of *شان*, never represent the nominative or the vocative case; but they represent all the oblique cases; and may be governed by any given verb or noun, without exception. They supply (when used in the genitive case) the want of possessive pronouns in the Persian language; as *اَسْمِ My horse*; or *The horse of me*; *قَلَمَتِ Thy pen*; or *The pen of thee*; *زَرِّش His gold*; or *The gold of him*; &c. And with the exception of a few particles and other words, such as *با With*, *بی Without*, *از From*, *در In*, *بر In*, *With*, or *By*, *و And*, *یا Or*, and some others; they may be accurately joined to any given word in a sentence, whether it be a noun, a verb, or a particle.

* The same terminations, when employed in the sense of the substantive verb, are supposed to be pronouns by many Grammarians: as *خَادِمَم I am a Servant*; *خَادِمِ Thou art a Servant*; *خَادِمِه We are Servants*; *خَادِمِهید Ye are Servants*; *خَادِمِنَد They are Servants*; &c. But no Grammarian has ventured to assign the word *خَادِمِ است* in *اِسْتِ He is a Servant*, to the class of pronouns; and I conceive that the terminations in question, when so used, are connectives of the same nature with the word *است*.

WHEN

WHEN joined to a verb, they are generally, but not invariably, governed by that verb in the objective case: as زدَمَش *I struck him*; گفتَمَت *I said to thee*; &c. The following example contains an exception; the words برَا بَلَدَمِ خَاطِرِ, being there used for بَرَا بَلَدَمِ خَاطِرَمِ.

تَوَقَّيْ مَرْدَانِ آن بَآکِ بُوَمِ بَرَا بَلَدَمِ خَاطِرَمِ زِ شَمَامِ وِ رُوَمِ

“ My regard for the people of that happy country detached
“ my heart from Syria and Greece.”

IN the event of their coalescence with words of any other species, the governing verb or noun will be best determined by consulting the context; but the following rules (such as these are) may possibly be of some aid to the judgment of the learner.

R U L E F I R S T.

IN the event of their coalescence with a verb, they will generally form the first or second object of that verb, as already stated.

E X A M P L E.

خَوْبِي وَ شُنْ و لَطَافَتِ مَه دَار دَا تَا رَحْمِ بَر مَآبِ شِقِ خُودِ نِیَمَتِ خُدا یَا بَدِشِ
بَشَايِ

“ SHE is possessed of all beauty, excellence, and grace; but
“ she has no pity for the pangs of her lovers; may God inspire
“ her with it.”—(خُدا یَا رَحْمِ بَرِده اَوَرا)

R U L E S E C O N D.

IN the event of their coalescence with the governing noun, they represent, invariably, the genitive case. Examples: اِسْمِ My horse; چَاکَرَتِ Thy servant; رَفْتَنِشِ His going; &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

IN the event of their coalescence with any other word, in the same sentence, they may also represent the genitive case, and the governing noun must be then determined by consulting the context.

EXAMPLES.

که تا بر فلک ماه و خورشید هست درین دفترت ذکر جاوید هست
سعدی

“ WHILE the Sun and the Moon keep their places in the Heavens, your praises (ذکر) shall be preserved in this volume.”
(درین دفتر) .

نیست اهل ورع آن مانده ز راه یکش بفسر تو کند دیده بجا
جامی

“ THAT wanderer in the paths of error cannot be numbered among the truly pious; whose eyes (که دیده اش بفسر تو نگاه کند) are open to the sight of any thing but thee.”

RULE FOURTH.

IN the event of their coalescence with the accusative, or first object of a transitive verb requiring two objects; they will generally form the second object of that verb. Examples: *اَشَم دَاو* *I gave him money*; *زَرَش بَخَشیدَم* *He gave me a horse*; *اَسْرَأیت کَفْتُ* *He abused thee*; &c. &c. &c.

RULE FIFTH.

IN the event of their coalescence with any adjective that may be used to modify the sense of a verb; they will form the first or second object of that verb. Examples: *مَتَشَس زَدَم* *I beat him severely*; *بَدَم آمَد* *It was unpleasant to me*; *خدا باقیَت دَارَد* *God preserve you*; or *God keep you alive*; &c. &c. &c.

RULE

R U L E S I X T H.

IN the event of their coalescence with the first component part of a compounded verb, they will generally form the object of that verb.

E X A M P L E.

ای که هرگز فراموش نمی
ایچوت از بسته بادنی آید
سعدی

"O THOU, my creator, who art ever present to my mind;
(هرگز ترا فراموش نمی کنم) dost thou ever bestow a thought on
me thy creature!"

R U L E S E V E N T H.

IN the event of their coalescence with a particle, as اگر If;
هرگز Never; و While; که That; &c. &c. they generally form
the first or second object to the verb comprised in that member of
the sentence to which they belong. The following are examples
of their coalescence with each of these words:—

اگرم جئات بجزی وگرم مات خواهی سیر بندگی بخدمت پرهم که پادشاهی

"WHETHER thou grantest me life, or desirest my death, I
submit to thy will; for thou art the Lord."

دست نه مشبیه بر انگشت پیچ که ازان رشته برتون نباید
نات ازان چشم بود بند و شاد هرگز ز رونید نقش مراد
جامی

"TWIST not your beads about your fingers, for it cannot
possibly be of any use. So long as your devotion proceeds

S

" from

“ from such a motive ; (تَا تَرَا اَزَانِ پَشْمِ بَد و شَد بُود) you
 “ will never attain the object of your wishes.” (نَقِشِ مُرَادِ هَر گِزِ)
 (مُرَادِ نَدِیدِ)

هَر سُو دَوْدِ اَن كِشِ زِدِرِ خِوشِ بَر اَنَدِ

“ He who is rejected of God (هَر كِه خُدا اَو را بَر اَنَدِ) wanders
 “ about and finds no home.”

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE preceding rule is also applicable in the event of their
 coalescence with certain other words ; such as the demonstrative
 nouns اَن *That* ; and اِيْن *This* ; their derivatives چُنْان or چُنْين ;
 the interrogative كِه اَم *Who ?* or *What ?* its derivative كِه ا *Where ?*
 or *In what place ?* the disjunctive pronoun اُو *He ; She ; or It ;*
 as كَوْت (كِه اَو تَرَا) and زَوْت (اَز اَو تَرَا) &c. &c. &c.

E X A M P L E S.

اِيْتِسْ كُوِيْدِ نِيْتِ چُوْنِ تُو دُر و جُوْدِ دُر جَمَالِ وَ تَقْضَلِ وَ دُر اِحْسَانِ وَ جُوْدِ
 مولوی معنوی

“ He tells him, thou hast no equal in the universe ; for
 “ beauty, beneficence, and excellence of every kind.”

THE Poet is speaking of the Language which a parasite holds
 to the man whom he desires to flatter.

و گَر تَرِه چُنَانَتِ دَامِ كُوشِ پَسِجِ كِه دَر اِيْنِ كِه اِيْنِ هِمِ وَ كُنْمَشِ زِيَا پَسِجِ
 نظامی

“ I SHALL otherwise chastise you in such a manner,
 (چُنَانِ كُوشِ پَسِجِ مُرَادِ اَمِ) as to convince you that you are
 nothing, or less than nothing.”

مگر نزد منی کجاست جویم تا با تو حدیث بخویش گویم
سید حسین

“ If thou art near me, where shall I seek thee, (مرا کجا جویم)
“ that I may inform thee of what I have to say ?”

نباشد پادشاهی زوت بهتر و راهم بست مدگی کن کوت بهتر
نظامی

“ You will find no better prince than he is; (namely, the DEITY)
“ serve him, for he is the best of masters.”

I HAVE not the least doubt that many exceptions to each of the preceding rules may be easily discovered in the Persian Language; and after all that can be said on the subject, the context will still furnish the best criterion, by which to determine, on every occasion, the true application of the conjunctive pronouns to the purposes of speech.

It only remains to be remarked, that these pronouns may supply in poetry, (but not in prose) the place of the word *و* خو, of which the application will be shewn hereafter. The following is one example, among many others that might be noticed.

تو می پدرش نظر پادداشت از غایت بخودش نشأت
نقی

“ So great was her (forrow or) confusion of intellect, that when
“ she cast her eyes on her father, (پدر خود) she did not know him.”

THE celebrated LYLEE is the nominative to the verb *و انداخت* and it is her own father, on whom she is said to have cast her eyes.

THE

THE following rules will shew the letters to be rejected or inserted, on occasion of the coalescence of the conjunctive pronouns with other words.

RULE FIRST.

THESE pronouns generally coalesce with other words, by the intervention of the vowel فتحة. Examples: اَسْمُ My horse; چَاگَرَت Tby servant; رُفْتَنَش His going; &c. This rule is applicable, even though they may happen to coalesce with a word which ends in ي following the vowels فتحة or كسرة. Examples: نَبَش His reed; نَاوَانِم My ignorance; قَرَزَانَكَبَش His knowledge; مِي گَفْتَنِم Thou wert speaking to me; &c.

RULE SECOND.

BUT after a word ending in ناي مُخَفَّف, or The gentle aspirate; the letter الف must be introduced, when the aspirate follows the vowel فتحه. Examples: خَانِه اَم My pen; نَامِه اَت Tby letter; جَانِه اَشَش His garment; &c. And if the gentle aspirate follow the vowel كسرة, the letter ي must be introduced instead of الف. Examples: دُجَش دُجِيت دُجِم دُجِه دُكَبَش دُكَبِت دُكَبِم دُكِر &c. After ناي مُظَهَّر, or The sensible aspirate, the pronouns follow the vowel فحه. Examples: پَادِشَا اَم My prince; زِرَّهَت Tby armour; &c. &c.

RULE THIRD.

AFTER every word ending in الف or دَاوِ مَعْرُوف or دَاوِ مَحْمُول the letter ي is generally inserted. Examples: عَصَا اَم My staff; رِگَبُوَت Tby ringlets; خُونَش His temper; &c. &c. &c. But the insertion of this letter, after دَاو, is not of necessity, but of optional observance. Examples: اَبَرُوَت دِهَنَدُوَم &c. رِگَبُوَش &c.

RULE

RULE FOURTH.

In poetry, these pronouns may coalesce with any verb or noun, not ending in **ی محقق**, by the intervention of the mark **سکون**; if that mark shall happen to be necessary to the accuracy of the verse: as **تَنَلَقُّمَتْ**, for **تَنَلَقُّمَتْ**, **خَرْمُشْ**, for **خَرْمُشْ** &c. &c. &c. In this case the pronouns may follow the letter **الف** at the end of a word, and the insertion of the letter **یا** will not take place.

EXAMPLES.

سَرَوِشَانِ اَز قَدِرِ عَاشِشِ دَادِ کُلِ خَبَرِ اَز طَلَعِ زَبَاشِ دَادِ
جامی

“ THE cypress is an emblem of her graceful form ; the rose is
“ a symbol of her beautiful aspect.”

پِشِ اَوَّلُطْفِ قَهْمَانِ قَهْمَانِ نُوْشِ دَارُوْشِ قَهْمَانِ زَهْرَمَانِ
جامی

“ GENTLENESS and severity, poison or its antidote, all are
“ alike in his eyes !”

THE poet is describing the character of an accomplished
SOOFEE ; whose mind must be so completely absorbed in the con-
templation of the DEITY ; as to be wholly incapable of deriving
pain or pleasure from any other source.

بَشْعَرِ اَرَوْبَا مِسْرِتِ نَامِ اَشْعَرِ اَرَامَرِ اَنكَلامِ
نظامی

“ BY the cultivation of poetry, you will attain eminence, for
“ poets are the most eloquent of mankind.”

T

شان

شان ثان مان

THE conjunctive pronouns, in the plural number, are very commonly used in poetry; and seldom or never occur in prose. Of these pronouns, the word **شان** may be used to form the nominative case; as in the following example from the poet خسرو.

شان دُرُوه و مایه شان بدشمال خونابه ز دیدگان سحرشاده

“ BEHOLD these ladies walking in the streets; and followed by
“ their lovers, who are weeping in blood !”

THIS, however, is a rare occurrence; and generally speaking, the conjunctive pronouns, whether in the plural or in the singular number, will be found to form the genitive or the objective case. When governed by a substantive noun, the conjunctive pronouns, in the plural number, must directly follow that noun; without the intervention of any thing but the **شَرِه اِضافَت**; or that particle which marks the second of two substantive nouns to be in the genitive case. But even the **شَرِه اِضافَت** is most commonly, and perhaps most elegantly omitted; as **بَتَه جاشها مان طفیل جان نِست**; in which, **مان** is connected with **جاشها**, without the intervention of the **اِضافَت**, which would be here expressed by the letter **یا** as **جاشهای مان** &c. The application of these pronouns, to the purposes of speech, seems to be unsusceptible of illustration by the rules of Grammar; and I shall only adduce two examples, to shew their occurrence in the genitive and objective cases.

مهرمان باد و دُر دای ساقیانِ بزمِ جم گرچه جام مانشد مهر می بدورانِ شما
لفظ

“ MAY your lives be long and happy, O you cup-bearers in the
“ banquet of JUM! though my cup has not been filled with wine
“ in your times.”

THE

commonly used by the writers of Persia ; any more than the word **اَوْفان** , which is a corruption of the plural **اَوافان** , and of which it would be difficult or impossible to prove the accuracy, by adducing a single example of its occurrence in the works of any Persian author of established reputation*.

THE disjunctive pronouns are sometimes found to supply, in poetry, the place of the reciprocal pronoun **مُحَو** ; as in the following example from the **نظامی** of **مُتَاجَات**.

اُمّی نظامی بَتَه پَرُو رَنُو بَر دَر کَس مَر اَنَش اَز دَر رَنُو

“ O GOD, of thee NEZAUMEE seeks protection ; do not therefore drive him away.” (**اَز دَر رَنُو اَو رَا مَرَان**)

THE third personal pronouns **او** and **وی**, and the plural **ایشان** have been supposed by many Grammarians to be invariably applicable to rational beings ; unless they follow the prepositions **در** and **بر** ; in which case, they are supposed to be common to all animate or inanimate nouns. Now it is true that the third personal pronoun is most commonly applicable to rational beings ; yet the examples of its application to the inferior animals, as well as to inanimate objects of every kind, are very numerous ; and their accuracy does not seem to have the smallest dependence on the presence or absence of the prepositions **در** and **بر** . I shall notice only two examples of this truth, among many others that might be adduced.

* The word **اَو** is said to have possessed formerly the sense of the third personal pronoun **او** ; but if so, it has been long obsolete, and is not now of the smallest practical use. It has been therefore omitted in the list of pronouns. Since I wrote this note, I have learnt that the pronoun **اَوْفان** is frequently used in conversation by the Persians.

چون ترنگ بر ایشان زور آورد وی آفت ویرا بر نیم سر و از ایشان دور گردی
جای

" WHEN they were attacked by the wolf, he (the bull) would
" keep him off with his horns."

زان سر شوگر خباری ستوی چشم آید مرا مردم چشم بر و ن آید بآستانقبال او
همالی

" MY eye balls leap from their sockets to meet the very dust,
" which is wafted from the street inhabited by you."

It is obvious that the pronoun *وی*, in the first example, (*آفت ویرا*) is referred to the *wolf*; and that the pronoun *او*, in the second example, (*آستانقبال او*) is applicable to the word *خبار* *Dust*; yet neither of the prepositions *در* and *بر* have any place in these examples; from which it may be inferred, that the application of the pronoun to inferior animals, or to inanimate nouns, has not the least dependence on the presence or the absence of these prepositions.

It only remains to be remarked of the personal pronouns, that the Poets some times trespass on propriety, by passing from the plural to the singular number, or vice versa, as in the following lines of سعدی.

نگهدار ما را از راه خطا خطا و در گداز و صوابم نما

" PROTECT us, O GOD, from the paths of error; pardon
" our sins, and shew us (me) the right way."

CHAPTER SECOND.

RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS.

خویش خویش خود

THESE pronouns are exactly synonymous; and they corroborate or confirm the meaning of any personal pronoun, to which they may happen to be occasionally subjoined. Examples: *I myself went*; *من خود رفتم بودم* ; *و تو خود رفتم بودی* ; *و ما خود رفتم بودیم* ; *و او خود رفتم بود* ; *و ایشان خود رفتم بودند* &c. In this, and I believe in every other sense, the pronoun *خود* is used more commonly than either of its synonymes *خویش* or *خویشتن*. The plural in it is often added to the pronoun *خود* by the natives of India; but if this be not improper, (as I believe it is, because I remember no instance of its occurrence in the writings of any good author) it is at least unnecessary; since *خود* is common to both numbers, and to all persons, as already explained. The cases, in which a given personal pronoun, must be superceded by the use of the reciprocal pronouns *خود*, *خویش*, or *خویشتن* (or vice versa,) may be easily discovered by the application of the following simple rules.

RULE FIRST.

WHENEVER an English personal or possessive pronoun (as *thee* or *thy*) shall occur in the same person with another pronoun, (as *thou*) which is the nominative to the verb, comprised in the same proposition or member of a given sentence; the place of the personal, or the possessive pronoun, must of necessity be supplied in Persian by the words *خود*, *خویش*, or *خویشتن*. Examples: *I am about my own business*; *من کار خود میکنم* or *من کار خویش میکنم* ; *I have beaten my own servant*; *زدم من را خود را* خود

تو کار خود میکنی I entered my own house; در آمدَم من بخانه خود
 Thou art about thy own business; زدِی تو غلام خود را Thou hast
 beaten thy own servant; در آمدِی تو بخانه خود Thou enteredst thy own
 house; زدِیم ما غلام خود را He is about his own business; او کار خود میکند
 We beat our own servant; در آمدید شما بخانه خود You entered your
 own house; فروختند ایشان اسب خود They sold their own horse;
 خود را خود کشت He killed himself; &c. &c. &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

BUT if the two pronouns shall not be of the same person, the word خود must be superceded by the personal pronoun. Examples: زدِی ترا زید ZYDE beat thee; اسب ترا خریدم I purchased thy horse; در آمدِی تو بخانه من You entered my house; &c. &c. &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE prevailing usage of the Persian language requires that the word خود should be significant of the same person, with that noun or pronoun which is the nominative or agent to a given verb, as already explained in the first rule. But the word خود is not unfrequently applicable to the object, and not to the agent of a given verb, and, in this case, its application will be ambiguous, if it shall not be illustrated by the use of the conjunctive personal pronouns. Examples: زید را در خانه خود دیدم و دیدی و دید عمر I saw, or Thou sawest, or AMR saw ZYDE in his own house; مرا در خانه خود دیدی و دید عمر Thou sawest, or AMR saw me in my own house; ترا در خانه خود دیدم و دید عمر I saw or AMR saw thee in thy own house. Let the conjunctive pronouns be here omitted, and it will be doubtful, in my opinion, whether the pronoun خود be applicable to the agent, or to the object of the verb. Example: زید را در خانه خود دیدم I saw ZYDE in my (or perhaps in his) own house. Let the verb نشسته be inserted after the word خود as زید را در خانه خود نشسته دیدم I saw ZYDE sitting

sitting in his (or perhaps in my) own house; and the ambiguity, even in that case, will not be entirely banished; but the probability will, as I conceive, be in favor of its application to the object of the verb *دیدم*. The reason seems to be this; that *ZYDE* is at once the *object* of the verb *دیدم*; and the *agent* or *nominative* to the verb *نشسته*; and if the sentence were thus rendered *دیدم زیدر آیدم که در خانه خود نشسته بود* *I saw ZYDE sitting in his own house*; it would then consist of two members; and the application of the pronoun *خود* would be no longer doubtful.

RULE FOURTH.

THE third personal pronoun *ش*, may be optionally added to the word *خود*; whenever that word is applicable to the third person. Examples: *خودش آمد* *He himself is come*; *خودش گفت* *He himself said so*; &c. And all the conjunctive pronouns may be added to the word *خود*, (as they are added to any other word) when they form the oblique, or the objective case. Example: *از آفتال خود شرم می آید* for *از آفتال خود مرا شرم می آید* *I am ashamed of my own actions*; &c. &c. &c.

CHAPTER THIRD.

اسماي اشاره

OR

DEMONSTRATIVE NOUNS.

اسم اشاره نزدیک		اسم اشاره فریب	
Sing. Nom. آن	That.	Sing. Nom. این	This.
Sing. Objec. { آنرا بدان	That, or To that.	Sing. Objec. { این را بدین	This, or To this.
Plur. Nom. { آنان آنها	Those.	Plur. Nom. { اینان اینها	These.
Plur. Objec. { آنها را بدانها	Those, or To those.	Plur. Objec. { بدینان اینها را بدینها	These, or To these.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE NOUNS are said to be distinguished from the PRONOUNS, *first*, because they cannot generally supercede the use of the *مُفْرَاة* or *Noun printed out*; with which, on the contrary, they commonly coalesce: as *أَنَّ مَرَّ* *That man*; *أَيْنَ زَن* *This woman*; &c. and, *secondly*, because they are said to be restricted, in their primitive acceptation, to material and sensible objects; in opposition to *pronouns*, which are supposed to be applicable in their primitive acceptation, to all objects of the understanding, as well as of the senses.

BUT neither of these definitions appears to me to convey a clear idea of the true nature of demonstrative nouns; and the last seems to be wholly nugatory, *first*, because demonstrative nouns are now more commonly applicable to abstracted ideas than pronouns themselves; and, *secondly*, because it is probable that both were restricted, in their primitive acceptation, to the objects of sense.

I AM disposed to believe that the demonstrative nouns are truly substantive nouns; and, if not pronouns in the strict and proper sense of the term, they approach very nearly, in their nature, to the pronominal character. For a pronoun has been defined to be *the substitute of a noun*; and the demonstrative nouns are, in my opinion, the true *substitutes* of those nouns by which they are commonly followed; as *أَنَّ مَرَّ* *That man*; *أَيْنَ زَن* *This woman*; &c. &c. &c. There are two arguments against the accuracy of this definition; both which I shall endeavour to state, and to answer, as well as I am able; leaving the reader to form his own judgment, when the question to be considered shall be fully before him.

First, it may be contended, that the use of a pronoun ought to supercede the use of the common substantive noun, of which its office is to supply the place; *secondly*, that the third personal

X

pronoun

pronoun *he*, does, accordingly, supercede the use of any given substantive noun, as *John* or *James*, &c. which it may happen to represent on a given occasion; *thirdly*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot generally supercede the use of the **مُسَارَاتِ** to which they refer; (the insertion of both being indispensibly necessary in most cases;) and, *finally*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot, therefore, be truly pronouns, in the strict and proper sense of the term.

Or it may be contended, *first*, that a pronoun is the true substitute of a common noun; *secondly*, that every pronoun ought, therefore, to represent the very same idea signified by a given substantive noun for which it stands; *thirdly*, that the third personal pronoun *he*, does, accordingly, represent the very same idea signified by any given substantive noun, as *John* or *James*, &c. of which it may be employed to supply the place; *fourthly*, that the demonstrative nouns have a demonstrative sense peculiar to themselves, which does not belong to the **مُسَارَاتِ**; and, *finally*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot therefore be truly pronouns; because a pronoun has *no sense*, but that of the noun of which it may be used to supply the place.

It is to be observed, however, that the use of a personal pronoun cannot always supercede the use of the common substantive noun, of which it is generally employed to supply the place; and, on the contrary, it would be easy to adduce many examples, in which the insertion of both is indispensibly necessary to the full comprehension of a given sentence; as in the case of a royal proclamation, beginning *We GEORGE THE THIRD by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain; &c. &c.* and other examples of the same nature. Let the pronoun be omitted in this example, and it will be obviously impossible to determine whether his Majesty, or any of his servants, be in fact the speaker; because the noun will assume the third person: (*GEORGE THE THIRD orders and ordains*) Let the noun be omitted, (*we order and ordain*) and there will

will be nothing to which we can refer the pronoun *we*. In the one case it may be asked whether HIS MAJESTY or somebody else be the *speaker* of the proclamation; in the other case it might be asked who is meant by the pronoun *we*. And this is equally true, not only of the written, but also of the oral communication of such a proclamation; supposing the speaker and the hearer to have no personal or previous acquaintance with each other.

It may be inferred, therefore, that the first personal pronoun (*I*) has, in fact, a sense peculiar to itself; for though it approaches very nearly to the sense of the word *SPEAKER* of which it may be said to supply the place; it is very easily distinguished from that word in the manner of its application; *first*, because a man must be himself the speaker of his own sentiments, before he can employ the pronoun *I*; (I am of opinion that so and so is the case) and *secondly*, because he may employ the word *speaker*, in relating the sentiments of another man. (The speaker is of opinion that so and so is the case, &c.)

It is obvious, therefore, that the extended application of the word *speaker* is greatly restricted by the pronoun *I*; or, in other words, that the pronoun *I* conveys the whole sense of the word *speaker*, together with a *new idea* or piece of information, which cannot be conveyed by that word. Now the existence, in the personal pronouns, of this new idea, which is peculiar to themselves, may be a very good reason for banishing the use of the term *pronoun* from the science of Grammar; but so long as that term shall be applied to the *personal nouns* of a given language, two of which have doubtless a sense peculiar to themselves, there can be no reason, why it may not be also applied to the demonstrative nouns of the same language, which have also a sense peculiar to themselves*.

FOR

* The sense of the first personal pronoun (*I*) cannot be fully conveyed by the substantive noun for which it stands; and hence, it must be absurd to maintain that this pronoun has no sense

FOR the existence, in certain personal nouns or pronouns, of a given sense, which is peculiar to themselves, is indeed the true principle that must be assumed before we can account for the necessary insertion of a pronoun, followed by the common substantive noun to which it refers; as *We GEORGE THE THIRD, King of Great Britain, &c. &c. &c.* This follows obviously from the following consideration; *namely*, that the insertion of the pronoun cannot be necessary to convey the *same* information which is conveyed by the noun. But if the pronoun shall convey (as we know to be the fact) a piece of information which is peculiar to itself, then doubtless, the insertion of both may be often necessary to the full comprehension of a given sentence; *first*, because the pronoun cannot be intelligible, if unaccompanied by the common substantive noun to which it refers; and, *secondly*, because the common substantive noun cannot convey that information which is peculiar to the pronoun.

It follows from the preceding observations, *first*, that certain personal pronouns have in fact, a sense peculiar to themselves; *secondly*, that this is the reason why a personal pronoun must be often followed by the common substantive noun to which it

sense but that of the word of which it may be employed to supply the place. The pronoun *I* is therefore *something more* than a mere pronoun; for this obvious reason, that it conveys *something more* than the sense of any given substantive noun which it may happen to represent on a given occasion. This consideration has induced one of my friends, who is engaged like myself in Grammatical pursuits, to reject the use of the term *pronoun*; and to substitute instead of it, the term *personal nouns*. I have no quarrel with the term *pronoun*; and merely mean to observe in this text, that both the personal and the demonstrative nouns or pronouns have clearly a sense peculiar to themselves. Now this sense which is peculiar to themselves must be often expressed in a given sentence; and as it cannot possibly be expressed, otherwise than by the insertion of the personal or the demonstrative nouns or pronouns, so these must be often accompanied by the common nouns to which they refer; because without these they would be unintelligible. The necessary insertion of the *مُفَارِئَةٍ* after a given demonstrative noun, as *that book* or *this letter*, does not therefore, furnish any convincing proof that the demonstrative noun is not the *substitute* of the *مُفَارِئَةٍ*; just as the necessary insertion of the common noun after any personal pronoun (*I John Grant* or *I James Grant, &c.*) does not furnish any convincing proof, that the first personal pronoun is not, in these examples, the *substitute* of the following substantive nouns.

refers;

refers; *thirdly*, that the demonstrative sense, which is doubtless peculiar to the demonstrative nouns, will furnish no sufficient reason for excluding these noun from the class of pronouns; and *finally*, that the general insertion of the *مُشَارَاتِيَّة* may be accounted for (as in the case of *WE GEORGE THE THIRD, &c.*) on principles perfectly consistent with the pronominal character of the demonstrative nouns.

HAVING premised these observations, I now proceed to state the circumstance on which the *nominal*, or *pronominal* character of the demonstrative nouns seems to depend; leaving the reader to adopt either of the two opinions to be stated by me, which shall be most consonant to the dictates of his own judgment; Every demonstrative noun must be a substantive or an adjective by its own nature; and if it be truly an adjective, the insertion of the *مُشَارَاتِيَّة*, or *following substantive noun*, will be invariably necessary to complete the construction of a given sentence; *first*, because the demonstrative adjective will denote the existence of a demonstrative sense in the following object or substantive noun; and, *secondly*, because it thence follows that the substantive must be understood, if it be not expressed, in every sentence. And if the demonstrative nouns be truly substantive nouns, they must be the pronominal names of the *مُشَارَاتِيَّة*; but as the latter may be any one, among an infinite number of objects which the mind of man is able to conceive, as *a book; a man; a horse; &c.* so, it will be generally necessary, in this case, to specify or define the *مُشَارَاتِيَّة* to which we allude on a given occasion, by the insertion of the common substantive noun. It appears, therefore, that whether the demonstratives *أَنْ* *That* and *إِيش* *This* be truly adjective or truly substantive nouns, the general insertion of the *مُشَارَاتِيَّة* will be equally necessary in either case.

To explain by an example. If the word *that* be truly an adjective, it then denotes the existence of a demonstrative sense in

Y

the

the following substantive noun ; as *book* ; *letter* ; *pen* ; &c. which must be understood, if it be not expressed. And in this case the word *that* cannot be assigned to the class of pronouns ; because it will be utterly impossible to establish any distinction between it, and any other simple adjective noun. But if the word *that* be truly a substantive, it must be the pronominal name of the *مُفَارِقَة* ; and the construction exhibited in the words *this book*, and *that letter*, will not be that of an adjective followed by a substantive noun, but that of two substantive nouns, (one of them being a pronoun) of which the second is employed to dispel the obscurity which hangs on the first ; as *This book*, or *This, namely the book, is very amusing* ; *That letter*, or *That, namely the letter, is full of entertainment* ; &c. &c. This last construction corresponds, exactly, with that of the pronoun *we*, followed by its noun of reference **GEORGE THE THIRD**.

In point of practical utility, it is a matter of little importance which of these opinions the reader may happen to adopt ; since the application of the demonstrative nouns, to the purposes of speech, will be exactly the same in either case. I presume, however, that those who hastily yield to first impressions will be less willing to admit the pronominal character of the demonstrative nouns, than those who shall consider the subject with deeper attention*. I now proceed to detail the rules, which guide and restrict the application of the demonstrative nouns to the purposes of speech.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE *إِسْمُ اِفْتِرَاقِ*, being accompanied by the common sub-

* When we speak of a *good man*, we mean to affirm that the attribute *goodness* exists in the man, or belongs to him. When we speak of *this* or *that man*, we certainly do not mean to affirm that the demonstrative sense exists in the man, or belongs to him ; because the demonstrative sense cannot possibly be the attribute of any man. It appears to me, therefore, that the demonstratives cannot be truly adjectives ; or, in other words, that they are substantive nouns.

stantive

stantive noun to which it refers, must precede and cannot follow that noun; as *آن کتاب* *That book*; *این جهان* *This world*; &c. It must, in this case, invariably preserve the singular number; even though the *مشاره* shall assume the plural number. Examples: *آن مردمان* *Those men*; *این زنان* *Those women*; *آن چیزها* *Those things*; *این چیزها* *These things*; &c. (In other words, the *اسم اشاره* is never put into the plural number, when followed by the common substantive noun to which it refers.)

R U L E S E C O N D.

If the *اسم اشاره* shall be applicable to a given substantive noun, expressed or understood or gathered from some part of the sentence, it must generally agree in number with that substantive noun; assuming either form of the plural in *آن* or *این*, according to the animate or inanimate character of the substantive noun.

E X A M P L E.

شراب لعل شکر و روی نه جبینان بین خلاف مذہب آنان بمال ایشان بین
حافظ

“ ENJOY the pleasures of wine, indulge in the contemplation
“ of female beauty; despising the creed of austere devotees, de-
“ vote yourself to the contemplation of female beauty.”

I HAVE not been able to translate this passage literally; but the reader will easily perceive, that the word *ایشان* is applicable to *نمہ جبینان*, with which it agrees in the plural number; and that the word *آنان* refers to *زاهدان* *the devotees*, which is not expressed, but merely gathered from the context. The devotees are the continual objects of the poetical enmity of HAFIZ, and of all the SOOFIES; a circumstance, however, which does not imply

imply (as it has been supposed to do) any want of reverence, on the part of the SOOZES, for that religion which they were taught to believe.

R U L E T H I R D.

If the **إِسْمِ اِشَارَه** shall be applicable to various nouns connected together by means of conjunctions, it will generally preserve the singular number; provided (but not otherwise) that these nouns shall be of the singular number and of the inanimate class.

E X A M P L E.

شاهد آن نیست که دارو خط سبر و لب لعل شاهد آنست که این دارو و آبی دارو
سلمان

I CANNOT easily translate these verses; and it will be sufficient to state, that the rule refers to the preservation of the singular number in the word **اِیْن**; which is applicable to **خط سبر و لب لعل**. Had these nouns been of the animate class; the demonstrative, on general principles, must have assumed the plural number.

R U L E F O U R T H.

If the **إِسْمِ اِشَارَه** shall be applicable to the sense of a preceding, or a following sentence; it must preserve the singular number.

E X A M P L E S.

فیم خسروئی دانی و نادان میبکشی خود را مرا این سوخت و زنده طعمه دشمن نمی سوزد

" You know, and yet pretend ignorance, of the misery of "KHOSRO; it is *this* which consumes me; not the censure of " my enemies, which I am able to bear."

خسروا

خُشْرُو اِيَنچ ندانم کي چه طاعت بُوداين زوي در کعبه و دل متوي بستان ختم

" I KNOW not, OKHOSRO, what sort of devotion is *this* of
" yours : your face, it is true, is directed to the Kaaba ; but your
" heart is devoted to the damsels of KHOOTAN."

R U L E F I F T H .

THE word **اِيَن** , when followed by the indefinite **يَايَ مَجْهُول** , denotes a certain undefinable elegance and gracefulness of form and manner ; and in this sense, it is very often used by the Persian poets ; as **بَشْدَه طَلَعَتْ اِيَن بَاشِكِرَ کِه اِيَني دَارَد** Devote yourself to her who is possessed of grace ; &c. The junction of the demonstrative nouns, by a copulative conjunction denotes every thing ; because there is nothing in the world, to which the relations of proximity and distance are not applicable. Example : **مَنْ فَرَايِنْدِ اِيَن و اِيَن ندانم** I have no thought of any thing ; that is to say, of every thing ; &c.

R U L E S I X T H .

WHEN the demonstrative nouns follow certain prepositions and other words, such as **بِرَ , دَر , اَز , کِه , &c.** the primary **الف** is generally rejected ; after transferring its vowel point to the preceding letter. Examples : **دِکَان دُرْبَرِيَن دِرْ اِيَن و دُرْبَرِيَن دِرْ اِيَن** &c. And the letter **ن** of the demonstrative **اِيَن** is changed into **م** before the words **دُرُوز** و **شَب** as **اِمْرُوز** و **اَمْسَال** To day ; **اَمْسَال** To night ; and **اَمْسَال** The present year ; &c.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

اِسْم مَوْصُول

OR

THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

THE following observations on the nature of the RELATIVE PRONOUN are extracted from the Grammatical Treatise in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

Z

IX

IN order to determine with precision the nature and import of the relative pronoun, it will be necessary to ascertain the powers which it contains, or the parts of speech into which it is capable of being resolved. Now it is obvious, that there is not a single noun, or prepositive pronoun, which the relative is not capable of representing: for we say, *I, who saw him yesterday*, cannot be mistaken; *you, who did not see him* may have been misinformed; *they, who neither saw nor heard*, can know nothing of the matter; *the things, which he exhibited were wonderful*. From these examples, it is apparent, in the first place, that the relative contains in itself the force of any other pronoun; but it contains something more.

IF from any sentence in which there is a relative, that relative be taken away, and the prepositive pronoun, which it represents, be substituted in its stead, the sentence will lose its bond of union, and stand quite loose and unconnected. Thus, if instead of saying *the man is wise who speaks little*, we should say *the man is wise he speaks little*, the sentence would be resolved into two; and what is affirmed of the man's wisdom, would have no connexion with the circumstance of his speaking little. HENCE it is evident, in the second place, that the relative contains the force of a connective, as well as of the prepositive pronoun. What kind of connexion it denotes, is next to be ascertained.

IT may be laid down as a general principle, that, by means of the relative pronoun, a clause of a sentence, in which there is a verb, is converted into the nature of an adjective, and made to denote some attribute of a substance, or some property or circumstance belonging to the antecedent noun. Thus, when it is said, *homo qui prudentia præditus est*, the relative clause *qui prudentia præditus est*, expresses nothing more than the quality of prudence in concrete with the subject *homo*, which might have been equally well expressed by the adjective *prudens*. In like manner, WHEN we say, *vir sapiens qui pauca loquitur*, the relative clause expresses the

the property of *speaking little* as belonging to the man, and as being that quality which constitutes, or from which we infer, his *wisdom*; but if there were such a word as *pauciloquens*, that quality might very properly be expressed by it, and the phrase *vir sapit pauciloquens* would express the same assertion with *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur*.

Now if a relative clause expresses that which might be expressed by an adjective, the presumption is, that it may be resolved into the same constituent parts. But every adjective contains the powers of an *abstract substantive*, together with an expression of connexion; and may be resolved into the *genitive case* of that substantive, or into the *nominative* with the particle *of* prefixed; which, in ENGLISH, corresponds to the termination of the *genitive* in the ancient languages. That the member of a sentence, in which there is a relative, may, in every instance, be analysed in the same manner, will be apparent from the following examples:—*Vir qui sapit*, *vir sapiens*, and *vir sapientiae*; a man who is wise, a wise man, and a man of wisdom; are certainly phrases of the same import. AGAIN, *homo, cui ingratus est animus, malus fit amicus*, may be translated into English, “ the ungrateful man, or the man of ingratitude is a bad friend.”

Thus then it appears, that the *relative pronoun* contains in itself the force of the *prepositive pronoun*, together with that *connexion* implied in English by the preposition *of*, and in the ancient languages by the *genitive case*. WHEN one says, *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur*, the relative clause *qui pauca loquitur* expresses that attribute of the man from which his wisdom is inferred: it is conceived by the mind, as stripped of its propositional form, and standing in the place of a substantive noun governed in the *genitive case* by *vir*. The whole sentence might be thus translated, “ the man of little speaking is wise;” or, did the use of the English language admit of it, “ the man of *he speaks little* is wise.” In like manner, when it is said, “ MAN who is born of woman is of few days

days and full of trouble ;” the relative clause is equivalent to an *abstract noun* in the genitive case, and the whole might be expressed in the following manner, “ man *of* *he is born of a woman* is of few days and full of trouble.”

THE preceding observations on the nature of the relative pronoun appear to me to be perfectly accurate ; and if they shall be fully understood, the reader will not be much surprised to learn, that there is not, properly speaking, any such thing as a relative pronoun in the Persian language. For if it be true, that “ every relative pronoun unites in itself the force of a *connective*, followed by *the antecedent*, or *its pronominal name*,” it is obvious, that the absence of all relatives might be easily supplied, in a given language, by *employing the necessary connective, followed by the antecedent, or its pronominal name*.

THIS plan has been accordingly adopted in the Persian language ; and the word *که*, which has been termed by Grammarians the *ایسم موقوف*, is, in truth, a SIMPLE CONNECTIVE ; belonging, as I conceive, to the class of PARTICLES ; and not to the class of nouns or pronouns. This connective cannot, however, be translated by the English *OF* ; and it seems to me, to have a much nearer affinity to the word *THAT* ; when this word is used in the sense, which has induced Mr. HARRIS to give it a place among the class of conjunctions ; as “ Thieves rise by night, that they may cut men’s throats,” &c. &c. &c. It is true, indeed, that Mr. TOOKE denies the existence of the conjunction *THAT* ; which he has resolved into a demonstrative noun, in every example that can be adduced : as, “ Thieves may cut men’s throats ; for *that* (purpose) they rise at night,” &c. &c. But though it may be true, that the English conjunction is the same word, that is to say, that it denotes *the same idea*, signified by the English demonstrative noun ; (and we know that both are represented by the same *sound*, namely, by the sound of the word *that*) it is nevertheless certain, that the DEMONSTRATIVE, and the

CONJUNCTION,

CONJUNCTION, are wholly unconnected in the Persian language. The demonstrative *ان* *That*, can never supply the place of the conjunction *که*; nor can the conjunction *که* *That*, supply the place of the demonstrative *ان*.

I REPEAT, therefore, that the words *که* and *چه*, (for *چه* is also a relative) which are improperly considered as nouns by the Persian Grammarians, are *simple connectives*; and consequently *particles*; corresponding, in point of sense, with the conjunction *that*. And hence it happens, that the recurrence of the antecedent or its pronominal name, in the relative clause of a given sentence, is sometimes optional; as *ادب آموزان ادب که او ادب از حضرت خدا آموخت*
 “ Learn purity of manners and conduct, from that master, who (*that he*) acquired purity from the DEITY himself;” and sometimes necessary; as *پنهان کی ماند آن رازی که آن را زنده بخشد*
 “ How can that secret remain concealed, which is the subject of conversation, or of which they speak, (or *that of it* they speak) in every company.”

It will be the object of the following rules, to ascertain the use and application of the words *که* and *چه*, when these words are employed as a bond of union, to connect the relative clause of a given sentence with its proper antecedent; and, in order that the rules may be fully understood, it is necessary to remark, *first*, that the antecedent is termed the *موصوف موصول*; or *that substantive, to which the relative clause of a given sentence is imputed in the form of an attributive*; *secondly*, that the connective *که* or *چه*, is termed *اسم موصول* or *the relative noun*; *thirdly*, that the member of the sentence to which it belongs, is termed the *محل* or *attributive*; and, *finally*, that the predicate, which is indispensibly necessary to complete the sense of the sentence, is termed, as usual, *مبتدأ*.

“ saw me : ” but generally speaking it ought to follow it, and the reversed order is more common in poetry than it is in prose.

R U L E F I F T H.

If the *اسم موصول* be a simple *connective*, and consequently a *particle*, as I have endeavoured to establish ; it follows that it will be wholly unsusceptible of variation by gender, number, case and person. Accordingly the *اسم موصول* is, in fact, unsusceptible of such variation, except in the single case of the elipsis adverted to in the preceding rule : namely, *ہرگز* for *ہرگز اور*. Every example, to be adduced in the subsequent rules will be found to confirm the accuracy of this observation.

R U L E S I X T H.

It has already been remarked, that every sentence in which there is a relative pronoun must comprise in itself an *antecedent*, which is generally the *subject* of the proposition ; a *relative clause*, which is ascribed to the subject, in the form of an *attributive* ; and a *predicate* or *مُسند* ; without which the sentence cannot convey a perfect sense. Now if the same antecedent shall be at once the *nominative* to the verb comprised in the relative clause of a given sentence, and the *nominative* to the verb comprised in the predicate or *مُسند* of the same sentence, the insertion of the antecedent will be sufficient for every purpose of perspicuity ; and the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided, as well in the predicate, as in the relative clause. Example : *ہرگز کہ ببیند روی تو معذور قرار یابد مَرَا* “ Whoever sees your face, “ will pardon me.” It would be awkward, in this case, to repeat the antecedent by inserting its pronoun ; (*ہرگز کہ او ببیند*, &c.) yet it may, nevertheless, be optionally repeated ; though the examples of its repetition are not very numerous in all probability*.

R U L E.

* Of its repetition, in the relative clause, the following example may however be adduced :

ہرگز

RULE SEVENTH.

If the same antecedent shall be at once the *accusative* or *object* to both verbs, the recurrence of its pronominal name will generally depend on the omission or insertion of the termination را, which marks the accusative or objective case. If the termination را shall follow the antecedent, the pronominal name will seldom recur. Example : *آنگاه که بخواند بدرکس ندواند* " God does not send the " man whom he selects, or calls to himself, to wander about from " door to door." In this example, it is obvious that the antecedent *آنگاه* is at once the accusative or object to both verbs ; and the termination را being here inserted, the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent is therefore avoided. Let the termination را be omitted, and the antecedent or its pronominal name will most commonly recur ; but it will be optional with the speaker to express it in either clause of the proposition, and perhaps, in many cases, to omit it entirely. Examples : *کسی که او را می خوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم* or *کسی که می خوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم او را* or *کسی که می خوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم* &c. &c.

If there be any such thing as a general rule, to guide the judgment of the learner in the omission or insertion of the pronominal name of the antecedent in such examples as these, it must be the following ; *namely*, that the pronominal name of the antecedent must be *inserted* whenever its omission would be detrimental to

هر که آواز همربانی شد جدا می توان شد گریه دار و صد آوا

" The man who is separated from his friend is poor in the midst of affluence."

And of its repetition, in the predicate of the proposition, the following example will suffice :

هر که در راحت و ششم زیست او چه داند که حال گریه و جنت

" He who lives in luxury and ease, how can he judge of the state of the hungry !"

B b

the

the perspicuity of the sentence ; and that it ought to be *omitted* in every other case. Now the words *نیکه بر منی خواندند بر سر نمی دوآند* would be obviously obscure ; because it is uncertain whether the word *سر* be the *agent*, or the *object*, of both verbs. Insert the termination, (*نیکه بر منی خواندند*) and the obscurity will cease ; or let the person of the verbs be changed (*نیکه بر منی خوانم*) and it will cease likewise. I conceive, therefore, that the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent cannot be necessary in either of these cases ; and that it *is* necessary ; whenever my understanding tells me, that its omission would be detrimental to the perspicuity of a sentence.

R U L E E I G H T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the *ظرف* to both verbs, the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided. Before I adduce an example, to illustrate the operation of this rule, I think it necessary to recall to the reader's mind the meaning of the term *ظرف* ; which has, however, been already explained. The term *ظرف* is applicable to *all* nouns which indicate the name of any portion of time or space ; as *وقت* ; or *شب* ; or *روز* ; or *بجای* ; &c. &c. &c. The preposition which ought to govern such nouns is very generally omitted ; as *روز قیامت* *On the day of judgment* ; *وقت نماز* *At the time of prayer* ; &c. &c. The following example will illustrate the operation of the eighth rule.

آن دم که بدم جوان و مویم شبه رنگ صد مجور بدی بدامتم در زده جنگ
این دم که بدم پیر و بر رخ بر آ رنگ از من زن و فرزند همی دار و تنگ

“ WHEN I was young and handsome, a hundred damsels
“ fought my love ; but now that I am old and wrinkled, my wife
“ and children are ashamed of my appearance.”

In this, as in every other case, the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent is unquestionably optional ; as
از من بیکه در آن دم جوان بودم &c. &c.

R U L E

R U L E N I N T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the *nominative* to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, and the *accusative* or *object* to the verb comprised in the *predicate* or *مُسْتَدِير* of the same sentence; the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided; but its insertion will yet be optional to every speaker. In the event of its insertion, it will, however, be generally reserved for the predicate of the proposition; and will be seldom repeated in the relative clause.

Example: *آنگاه زنده دارد و هیچ شماردش* "He who has no money, they (mankind) account him as nothing." The pronominal name of the antecedent, which is here inserted in the predicate of the proposition, is wholly omitted in the following example:

دل که طومار و فابود من مخزون را باره کردند نه بسته بتان مضمون را
آصنی

"My afflicted heart, which was a volume of constancy, they have torn in pieces; ignorant of its contents."

R U L E T E N T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the *accusative* or *object* to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, and the *agent* or *nominative* to the verb comprised in the *predicate* or *مُسْتَدِير* of the same sentence; the recurrence of its pronominal name, in either clause of the sentence, (that is to say, in the relative clause, or in the *مُسْتَدِير*) will generally depend on the omission or insertion of the particle *را* after the antecedent. If the particle *را* shall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally occur in the relative clause. Example:

هر کس که او را طامع بینی طایب خیر نیست "The man whom you perceive to be avaricious, is not desirous to practise virtue." And in the event of its insertion, the pronominal name of the antecedent

will

will be generally omitted ; as *هَر کَرَا طَامِعِ بَشِنِی طَالِبِ خَیْرِ نِیَسْت*. Yet there is no obscurity in the words *هَر کَرَا طَامِعِ بَشِنِی طَالِبِ خَیْرِ نِیَسْت*, which are consequently accurate ; notwithstanding the omission of the termination *را* ; and hence it may be inferred, that the insertion of the pronominal name of a given antecedent is never necessary, but for the purpose of dispelling some doubt or obscurity, which its omission might tend to create in the sentence. In the event of its insertion, it may occur in either clause of the proposition according to the option of every speaker ; as *هَر کَرَا طَامِعِ بَشِنِی اَوْ طَالِبِ خَیْرِ نِیَسْت* ; &c. &c.

R U L E E L E V E N T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the *nominative* to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, and the *وَرْت* to the verb comprised in the *predicate* or *مُسَدِّد* of the same sentence ; the recurrence of its pronominal name, in either clause of the sentence, will generally depend on the omission or insertion of a preposition before the antecedent. If the preposition shall be inserted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will seldom recur. Example : *دَرْ سَرایِ دُنْیَا کِه بَقَا نَدَارَد اَرَامِ نَبَا یَد کَرَد* " Rest not in this world which is transitory." And if it shall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally recur in the predicate of the proposition, as in the following example : *سَرایِ دُنْیَا کِه بَقَا نَدَارَد دُرُو اَرَامِ نَبَا یَد کَرَد* " The habitation of the world which is transitory ; rest not in it." But the following example will shew, that the omission of the preposition before the antecedent, is not always followed by the insertion of its pronominal name in either clause of a given sentence :

زَمَانَه مِی شَمَکَنَد خَارِ عَدَّتَه دَرْ جَاگَرَم دُمِیکِه بِی رُخِ آن کُلْخِذ اَر مِی گَزَرَد
خواجه عَدَمَت

" I SUFFER the utmost rage of fortune, during every instant of
" of my absence from the woman I love."

I HAVE

I HAVE not been able to translate these lines literally ; but it is obvious that the *predicate*, or مُشَبِّه, is here comprised in the first line ; and that the second contains the antecedent together with the relative clause. The sense of the verse might be thus rendered :
ووقت بیا در مفارقت آن کار نداری گذر و در آنوقت زمانه خار غم در جگر می شستند
and the insertion of the words : در آنوقت is optional only, but not necessary ; since the sense of the sentence would be sufficiently perspicuous, though these words were taken away.

R U L E T W E L F T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the ظرف to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given proposition, and the nominative to the verb comprised in the *predicate*, or مُشَبِّه of the same proposition ; the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally depend on the insertion or omission of a preposition before the antecedent. If the preposition shall be inserted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will seldom recur in either clause ; as در شهریکه بدل نباشد عجب است که دیران نشود.
“ In a city where justice is not administered, it will be
“ surprising if it does not go to decay.” If the preposition shall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally recur in the relative clause. Examples :
شهریکه درو بدل نباشد عجب است که دیران نشود. But many examples of its omission might be found or made : as
و ساعتی که مرا دیدی مبارک است &c. &c.

R U L E T H I R T E E N T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the *accusative* or *object* to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, and the ظرف to the verb comprised in the *predicate* or مُشَبِّه of the same sentence ; the preposition applicable to the ظرف will be generally expressed before the antecedent, and the pronominal name will seldom recur in either clause. Example :

C c

بحانه

“ I entered the house which I built,” or if **this** order shall be reversed, the same rule will be still applicable. Example: **بهر حالى كه باشى غيبت دان** “ Be satisfied with your condition, whatever it may be.” But the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent will be doubtless optional in either case. Examples: **بجانه كه آن را ساخته و رآدم**; **بهر حالى كه باشى آن را غيبت دان** &c. &c. &c.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

It often happens that the antecedent to a relative pronoun is *indirectly* connected with the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, by the intervention of another substantive noun. In this case, the pronominal name of the antecedent *must* be of necessity inserted in the relative clause. The following is an example. **دل آزارى كه بيمارم ز چشم نامستلما نش** “ A tormenting beauty, of whose infidel eyes I have felt the force”. It is obvious that the introduction of the word **چشم**, which here forms the bond of union between the *antecedent* and the *verb* comprised in the relative clause, renders the insertion of the pronominal name of the antecedent (**دل آزارى كه چشمش بيمارم**) indispensably necessary in that clause. There are very few exceptions to this rule in the Persian language.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

It often happens that the antecedent to a relative pronoun is *indirectly* connected with the verb comprised in the *predicate* of a given proposition, by the intervention of another substantive noun. In this case, the pronominal name of the antecedent *must* be inserted in the predicate of the proposition, and the sentence will exhibit a form of construction, which seems (for what reason I cannot tell) to be generally proscribed in our language. Example: **خسانى كه درين باب از حكما منقول است و جهش اينكه** The opposition “ of

" of opinion stated to have subsisted among the philosophers on this
 " subject; the circumstances of it (namely, of *that opposition*) are
 " these". This sentence is perfectly accurate according to the
 structure of the Persian language; though the construction, ex-
 hibited in my translation, may not be idiomatical in our tongue.

The letters of ABOOL FUZL abound in similar examples : as

هرگونه صورت دلی پذیر که در بتجسس ضمیر تحقیق بود خوشتر
 از آن بر منتهی ظهور جلوه نماید

" Every admirable plan, which I meditated in my mind, was
 " more than executed." (صورتی خوشتر از آن صورت جلوه نماید)

It must be admitted, however, (though not in this instance) that
 ABOOL FUZL often sets at defiance the plainest rules of Gram-
 matical science; and the use which he makes of the relative
 pronoun, in the following example, will furnish one specimen,
 among many others that might be adduced.

و نیز از ملکوتات حاکمیت برست آن بود که حاکمیت را که غریبی متممیت
 روز افزون بر ساحل دریای شور است و بر زیر و ستان آن سرز بوم راو
 معدلت نمی سپرد تصایح آتش افزای فرموده به شاهراه فرمان برداری
 ره نمون گردد

" I HAD also determined to admonish, and lead to my obe-
 " dience, the ruler of T'hatta; which (country) is situated on
 " the shores of the ocean, to the west of my own dominions;
 " and which (ruler) governs not his subjects, according to the
 " principles of justice."

I BELIEVE that this reference of the relative pronoun, in the
 first place, to the *country*; and, in the second place, to the *ruler*;
 must be considered as reprehensible, according to all the rules
 of rational Grammar.

* Here the word **خلاف** which is the antecedent, is connected with the verb **است**, (which
 is *understood* in the predicate) merely by the intervention of the word **و**.

R U L E S I X T E E N T H.

In a given sentence, of which the first part contains an antecedent followed by a relative pronoun, the predicate of the proposition will be frequently omitted; and its place will be supplied by another sentence, from which the true predicate may be accurately and easily inferred.

E X A M P L E.

هر که از غیر خود بیگانه
وَرع این است و دیگر اَنبانه
جای

“ **WHOEVER** has estranged himself from every thing but thee,
“ **this** only is piety, and every thing else is vain mockery.”

The demonstrative noun این *This*, is here applicable to the sense of the relative clause of the sentence; namely از غیر خود بیگانه. “ **E**strangement from every thing but God;” and the true predicate of the proposition (namely و رع این است or any other words to the same effect) is omitted, to make way for the definition of piety contained in the second line. The following is another example of the same nature; and many more might be easily adduced.

حسابی که فرمود رای باشد کس از پیش بینی نماید گزید
نظامی

“ **Y**our observations on this subject (*است*) are
“ **excellent**,) for no one will ever suffer by the practise of a
“ **prudent** foresight.”

R U L E S E V E N T E E N T H.

It appears from the preceding rules, that the pronominal name of the antecedent is sometimes inserted in the relative clause

clause of a given proposition ; and sometimes inserted in the predicate, or مُسَدِّد of the same proposition. The following example will shew that it may be accurately introduced into both.

یَا رَبِّ اَیْنَ تَوَكَّلُ خَدَانِ کِی شِیْر دِی بَمَشِشِ مِی سُبَّارَمِ یَتَوَازِدَتِ رَسُوْدِ چَمَشِشِ
حافظ

I LEAVE the reader to translate these verses, of which the sense will be easily understood ; and shall only observe that the pronominal name of the antecedent, which is represented by the third personal pronoun *ش*, occurs in *each* member of the sentence, as the accusative or objective to the verb *سُورِدَن*.

R U L E E I G H T E E N T H.

THE pronominal name of the antecedent may be superceded by the recurrence of the proper antecedent ; or of any descriptive epithet which is applicable to it.

E X A M P L E.

اَرِسْطُو کِ دَن تَوَر دَر غَاہِ تُوْدِ بَہْرَنِبَاکِ وَ بَد تَحْمِیْمِ شَاہِ تُوْدِ
یَسْکَنْدَرِ بَشَدِ بَشِیْر دَا نَا وَ یَزِیْرِ بَکَمِ رُوْز گَا رِی شُد اَنَاقِ گِیْر
نظامی

“ ARISTOTLE, who was his chief minister, and the confidant
“ of all his secrets; ALEXANDER by the management of that
“ able minister (namely ARISTOTLE) soon became a great
“ conqueror.”

In this example the words *وَاَنَا وَ یَزِیْر* are obviously applicable to ARISTOTLE; whose proper name or pronominal name (*یَسْکَنْدَرِ بَشَدِ بَشِیْر* or *یَسْکَنْدَرِ بَشِیْر اَرِسْطُو*) might supercede these words, without injury to the sense of the sentence.

D d

I r

IT only remains to be remarked, that whether the antecedent to a relative pronoun shall be a common substantive noun, or a pronoun in the first, second, or third persons; the rules for its omission or insertion, in the predicate, or in the relative clause of a given proposition, are, in all cases, precisely the same. Thus, the first personal pronoun, being the antecedent, is repeated in the relative clause of the following sentence:

“ **مَنْسَكِه دَر پَشِش مَن پَر خَاك وَجَرِ سِيَم** ” I who hold dirt and silver in equal estimation;” &c. &c. and its repetition is not merely optional, but necessary; because it is *indirectly* connected with the verb understood in the relative clause of the proposition, by the intervention of the word **پَشِش** *The front*; which is a substantive noun of the class termed **فَرَف** as already explained.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

اَسْمَاءُ اِلْتِفَاقِيَّةٌ

OR

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

THE following account of the interrogative pronouns is extracted from the Grammatical Treatise in the **ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA**.

“ **WE** have said that the interrogative pronouns, as they are called, *who, which, what*, are intimately connected with *relatives*; we now affirm, that the *two first* of these words are *nothing* but relatives, and that the *last* contains in itself the united powers of a *relative* and *definitive*. With respect to *cases, number, and gender*, the words *who* and *which*, when employed as *interrogatives*, differ not from the same words when employed as *relatives*; and we hold it as a maxim, without which science could not be applied to the subject of language, that the *same word* has always the same *radical import* in whatever different situations it

it may be placed *. To understand this, it is necessary to observe, that all men have a natural propensity to communicate their thoughts in the fewest words possible: hence it follows, that words are often omitted which are necessary to complete the construction of the sentence; and this no where happens more frequently than in the use of *who* and *which*. In sentences where *these words are confessedly RELATIVES*, we often find them without an antecedent; as,

“ *Who steals my purse, steals trash*,”—SHAKESPEARE.

“ *Which ~~who~~ would learn, as soon may tell the sands*.”—DRYDEN.

“ *Qui Baviu non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi*.”—VIRG.

That is, “ *He who steals my purse, &c.*” “ *which ~~he~~ who would learn, as soon &c.*” and “ *Ille qui Baviu non odit, &c.*” Such abbreviations occasion no obscurity, because from previous circumstances the hearer knows the mind of the speaker and the persons to whom he refers. But it is not with respect to the *relative* and *antecedent* only that such abbreviations have place: in sentences of a different form, whole clauses are sometimes omitted, while the meaning of the speaker is made sufficiently plain. Thus when KING RICHARD III, having lost his horse in battle, exclaims, “ A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!” there is no complete thought *expressed*; but the circumstances in which the King then was, enabled those about him to understand that he *wanted a horse*. Accordingly CATESBY answers him, “ With—
“ draw, my Lord, I’ll help you to a horse.”

* THIS mischievous maxim would be alone sufficient, in my opinion, to prevent for ever the progress to perfection of grammatical science. For it amounts to an assertion that *two ideas are never represented, in a given language, by the same sound*; than which (notwithstanding the high authority of Mr. TROTT, and of those who have adopted it on his authority) nothing can be more erroneous in point of fact; or more untenable by the force of reason. I believe; with the writer on the Encyclopedia, that the word *who* is truly a relative pronoun, even when employed to ask a question; and the reasons, on which my belief is founded, are detailed with great perspicuity in the dissertation in the text which I have borrowed from him. But if his maxim be just, there is an end to the necessity for any farther arguments on the subject; for we know that the interrogative and the relative are both expressed by the same word or sound; *namely*, by the sound of the word *who*; from which it follows, according to that maxim, that the idea signified by both is and must be of necessity the same. So, also, a Taylor’s bill should be a bird’s bill, since both are signified by the word *bill*; or a box in the car should be a chest of wood, since both are signified by the word *box*.

In like manner, when a person asks a question, his expression is frequently incomplete; but the tone of his voice, or some other circumstance, enables us to ascertain his meaning, and to supply if we please, the words that are omitted. Thus when it is said, *An fecisti?* nothing more is expressed than, *If you did it* (the Latin *an* being nothing else but the Greek *ἂν*); but some circumstance enables the person who hears it to know that the meaning is "say if you did it." Let us apply these observations to the words *who* and *which*. If these words be *relatives*, and if our analysis of the relative be just, it is obvious, that no complete meaning can be contained in the clause, "who is your principal friend?" for that clause contains nothing more than the circumstance of *being your principal friend* predicated of some unknown person; "of he is your principal friend." That this is indeed the case, every man may be convinced, by asking himself what he means by the interrogative *who* in such a sentence? for he will find it impossible to affix to it ANY meaning without supplying an antecedent clause, by which that which is called an *interrogative* will be immediately converted into the *relative pronoun*. The custom, however, of language, and the tone of voice with which the *relative clause* is uttered, intimates, without the help of the *antecedent*, the wish of the speaker to be informed by the person addressed of the name and designation of his principal friend; and we know that the sentence when completed is, "Tell me the name and designation of the person who is your principal friend." Again, when the prophet says, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?" he utters but part of a sentence, which when completed will run thus: "Describe the person who cometh from Edom (this is that person) with dyed garments from Bozrah." He sees a person coming from Edom, of whose name and designation he is ignorant, he calls upon some one for information concerning these particulars; and that there may be no mistake, he describes the unknown person as having dyed garments from Bozrah; but lest even that description

scription should not be sufficiently accurate, he throws in the definitive clause, *this is that person*, pointing at him, we may suppose, with his finger. *Which*, used as an interrogative, indicates a wish of knowing a particular person or thing out of more than one mentioned; as, "which of the two did it?" that is, "Tell me the one of the two which did it;" for in old English *which* as a *relative* is often used, where in modern English we should say *who*; and that mode of speech is still retained when the antecedent is omitted, and the relative clause employed to indicate such a wish as that before us. *What* includes in itself the signification of a *definitive* and a *relative pronoun*; as, "from *what* has gone before, *what* follows may easily be guessed;" where the word *what* is equivalent to *that which*. When therefore we say, "what rule fellow is that?" our meaning is, "Describe that person who is that rude fellow." Upon the whole, then, it is evident, that the words called *interrogatives* are merely *relative pronouns*; and that *interrogative sentences* are *relative clauses* uttered in such circumstances as to enable the hearer to supply the antecedents necessary to complete the meaning.

* * * * *

If the preceding observations be founded in truth, it should seem to follow, as a matter of necessity, that *every interrogative* in a given language may be accurately employed as a *relative* in the same language. For if those pronouns, which we call *interrogative*, be truly and of necessity *relative pronouns*; there can be no reason, why any one of them may not be employed as a *relative*; that is to say, in its true and proper sense. Now we know that the *interrogative pronouns* of our language are in fact employed as *relative pronouns*; nor can it be denied, that the same observation is very generally applicable to the *interrogative pronouns* of other tongues.

It is probable, therefore, that *relative pronouns* do, in many languages, supply the absence of *interrogative pronouns*; or,

E c

in

in other words, that there is not in the English, (and so also of many other tongues) any such thing as an interrogative, contradistinguished from a relative pronoun. The ability of most interrogatives, in every language, to assume the sense of relative pronouns, will fairly justify this inference; but it does not follow of any given class of nouns, that because they have no existence in one language, therefore they can have no existence in another tongue. On the contrary, it would be easy to prove (see the *إِسْمُ ظَرْفٍ* and the *إِسْمُ آتٍ* of the Arabic language,) that the same class of nouns, which is familiar to the structure of one language, is often wholly unknown to many others; and hence it follows, that the absence in the English, or in any other language, of interrogative as contradistinguished from relative pronouns, can be no proof of their absence from every tongue.

THE existence or non-existence of such pronouns, in any given language, must be therefore determined by adverting to facts; and these will soon decide the question, since we need not look beyond the Persian language, in order to discover an interrogative pronoun (namely the word *کدام* *Who? What? or Which?*) that cannot be used in a relative sense. The existence of this pronoun, which admits of no antecedent, because it is never used in a relative sense, seems to me to overthrow at once, the arguments of those who would supply an antecedent to every interrogative, because "it is impossible to affix to the latter any meaning, without supplying an antecedent clause:" and I cannot therefore believe, that the proposition *کدام کس است این* *Who is this man?* is in any respect less perfect or complete, than the same proposition, expressed in any other possible way.

IT is true indeed, that we may supply an antecedent in the English language: as "Tell me the name or profession of him who is 'this man'" but the perspicuity of the sentence will not be increased, but greatly diminished, by the insertion of the antecedent;

dent, since it is wholly owing to the relative character of the pronoun *who*, that we are here at liberty to supply an antecedent. For if that pronoun were deprived of its relative character, it would not, as an Interrogative, admit an antecedent; nor can the antecedent be supplied in the Persian Language, where the proposition is formed by means of the Interrogative *کدام*, which cannot be employed as a relative pronoun.

It follows from these observations, that the words called interrogative are not of necessity relative pronouns; though it is most probably true, that relative pronouns do, in the English, and in many other tongues, supply the absence of interrogative pronouns. But if there be any such thing as an Interrogative, contradistinguished from a Relative pronoun, it must be intelligible without reference to any antecedent: *first*, because we know that the antecedent to such a pronoun cannot be supplied; and *secondly*, because that which cannot be supplied, is never wanting to the perfection of a given proposition. Let it now be admitted that every interrogative can be resolved into an antecedent followed by a relative pronoun; as "Who is your principal friend," or "Tell me the name of him who is your principal friend," and, supposing the word *who* to be truly interrogative, and not relative in this example; it will thence follow, that the interrogative *who* contains in itself the force of *the antecedent*, and of the relative *who*. But "him who is your principal friend," does not form a perfect interrogative sentence; and whatever is wanting to the perfection of the sentence, *that*, also, must be comprised in the interrogative *who*.

For we know that a single word (as yes or no) may comprise in itself the force of a whole proposition; (I admit the fact, or I deny the inference;) and hence it follows, that we need not hesitate to assert the existence, in a true interrogative pronoun, of every thing necessary to its perfection, as the first member of an interrogative sentence. To conclude. The existence or non-existence

existence of interrogative, as contradistinguished from relative pronouns, is a matter to be determined by adverting to facts; and the fact of their existence being established in the case of the Persian words *کہو* *who?* *کدام* *which?* *کی* *when?* *چون* *how?* *کجاست* *where?* &c. &c. there is at once an end to the argument; and we have nothing more to do, but merely to discover the true resolution of an interrogative sentence; and to affirm, in the pronoun, the existence of every thing which is necessary to the perfection of the sentence; that is to say, *to its intelligible character, as an interrogative pronoun.*

THE interrogative pronouns of the Persian language amount to the number of nine; but of these there is one, namely *چند* *How many?* which is now seldom or never used. Of the rest I shall proceed to treat in their order; having first premised, that the observations which I am enabled to offer on the use and application of interrogative pronouns, are of little importance in my own eyes. In point of fact, there is nothing to distinguish the application of these pronouns, from that of common substantive nouns; and all that can be said on the subject, will be common to the corresponding parts of speech in every tongue. That the reader may understand the following rules, it is necessary to remark, that the subject of enquiry is termed, in Persian Grammar, *موضوع* or *موضوع*, and sometimes, simply *مضاف الیه*; because it is supposed to be governed by the interrogative pronoun, in the genitive case.

چی ANCIENTLY

Who? What? or Which?

R U L E F I R S T.

THIS pronoun still retains the letter *چ* in the word *چیت* and drops the last letter in its conjunction with any other word; as *چو چو* &c. It is common to all nouns whether animate

animate or not; as *چه کس است*; *چه چیز است*; *چه گویند*; *چه حال داری*; &c. &c. But if the *مستقل*, or *following substantive noun*, shall not be expressed; it is generally or invariably restricted in its application to inanimate nouns. Example: *پیش چیست* *What is before you?* *چی گوید* *What does he say?* &c. It admits of the inanimate form of the plural number; as *کس نمیداند که بازید بچه چاره چها کرده اند و می کنند* "No body knows how they have treated, and how they continue to treat the unfortunate ZYDE." (N. B. The word *چه* is clearly interrogative, not relative, in this example.)

R U L E S E C O N D.

WHEN followed by the termination *ا*, it corresponds in point of sense, with the word *why?* that is to say, it demands the *reason* or *cause* of a given effect. Examples: *چرا آمدی* *Why did you come?* *چرا رفتی* *Why did you go?* &c. It cannot therefore be followed by the termination *ا*, when it forms the object to a transitive verb. Examples: *چه گفتی* (not *چرا گفتی*) *What did you say?* *چه کردی* (not *چرا کردی*) *What did you do?* &c. But *چه*, as well as *چرا*, is sometimes used by the poets to signify *why?*

E X A M P L E.

ایکبر باد جهان کار تو نطف و کرم است در حق اهل محبت چه جفا و ستم است

"O THOU who art favorable even to thy enemies; why (*چرا*) art thou cruel to those who love thee!"

R U L E T H I R D.

THE word *چه*, like other substantive nouns, may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to say, it may be accurately put into any given case without exception. Exam-

F f

ples:

این شراب چه چیز است؟ *Who is this man?* چه کس است این؟ *Of what is this wine made?* چه کردی *What have you done?* از چه سبب رنجیده شدی *Why are you vexed?* ع. ع. ع. In the genitive case, it is, however, most commonly superseded by the word *Of what is this wine made?* این شراب کدام چیز است *as* کدام ع. ع.

* * * * *

It is usual among the Persian Grammarians to illustrate, by many examples, the *rhetorical application* of interrogative pronouns. Now it appears to me, that this application is nearly the same in every language; yet the reader may not be displeased to peruse the following examples, among many others that might be adduced.

First. THE word چه is employed to form the استهزاءکناری, or that sort of interrogative, by which a speaker means, in reality, to deny the proposition comprised in the *مَسْئُولِ عَنْهُ*. Example: “بر در می خانه حرف خانقاه ای شیخ چیست” Who talks of a temple at the door of a tavern? that is to say, *No man can be guilty of such an absurdity.*

Secondly. It is employed to form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to express his admiration of the *مَسْئُولِ عَنْهُ*.

EXAMPLE.

این چه منزلت است این چه مقام است اینجا
عیش باقی لب ساقی می و جام است اینجا

“WHAT a heavenly habitation is this, which unites the pleasures of love and wine!”

Thirdly.

Thirdly. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to express his earnest desire, that the person addressed shall be prevailed on to comply with a given requisition.

EXAMPLE.

چه بانشد رگ سنجی بر می که در شبهای تنهایی
فریبشی ز بر دیوار ت چه گوئی می شد شبها

“ O! if you would condescend to enquire into the state of a
“ poor stranger, passing his tedious and solitary nights, under
“ the walls of your habitation !”

Fourthly. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to force the assent of his hearer to the truth of a given proposition.

EXAMPLE.

گر من نه غرق آتش و آیم ز دست تو
این سینه ز آتش و چشم هر آب جیت

“ I suffer not, through your means, all the miseries of
“ fire and water; what mean these, my streaming eyes and
“ burning breast !”

Fifthly. It may form that sort of interrogation, which implies the contempt of the speaker for the actions or sentiments of a given individual. Example: *زنده چه خوب کاری ساخت* *How finely* (that is to say, *How ill*) *ZYDE has managed on this occasion !*

Sixthly. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to assert the equality, or deny the difference, between two or more objects or events. Examples:
چه بر تخت مردن چه بر روی خاک *Seventhly.*

Seventhly. It may be employed in detailing the subordinate species, comprised in a given generic noun. Example: *دو صد نفرش ز دیبای گرامی چه مصری و چه رومی و چه شامی* "Two hundred carpets of the finest brocade; whether of Syrian, Grecian, or Egyptian manufacture."

Eighthly. It may be, and very often is, prefixed to that member of a sentence which defines the cause of a preceding observation. Example: *خانی باید که بدینا دل نهد چه دنیا ناپایدار است و اعیان و بقا رانشاید* "A wise man ought not to set his affections on this world; why? because the world is transitory, and passeth away." The word *چه* is clearly interrogative in this example; and must be therefore uttered with that tone of voice which is suited to a question. There is an obvious pause before and after the word *چه*, which stands, as it were, completely aloof from either of the preceding or following propositions. I must request the readers particular attention to this application of the interrogative pronoun; because the examples of its occurrence are very numerous in the Persian language.

It would be easy to add many other examples of the rhetorical application of the pronoun *چه*; but the preceding are sufficient for every purpose of practical utility, since the nature of the rest may be easily inferred from the consideration of the examples already adduced. I shall therefore now proceed to illustrate, by a very few examples, the use and application of the pronoun *کی*.

کی ANCIENTLY *Who?*

• RULE FIRST.

THIS pronoun still retains the letter *یا*, in the word *کیست*; and drops the last letter in the word *کرا*. It is entirely restricted in its application to rational beings; and therefore admits of none but,

but the animate form of the plural number in *ان* as *شماره* "Who are they?" &c. &c. It cannot, like the word *چه*, be followed by the *مضاف الیه* for though *پرسش است* is perfectly accurate *پرسش است* would be absolute nonsense. It may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to say, it may form any given case without exception. Examples: *که گفت* "Who said so?" *کسان چاکر که باشد* "Who is that?" *کسان کیست* "Whose servant may that be?" *که دادی* "To whom did you give it?" *که از وی* "Whom did you beat?" *از که شنیدی* "From whom did you hear this?" &c. &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE rhetorical application of the pronoun *که* is nearly the same with that of the pronoun *چه*; and I shall therefore notice only one example, in which both pronouns are emphatically used together, in order to add to the emphasis and force of the question.

فایز تو رومی و دل زنجی است رو که سر این بیخوده یار منی است
 با این رومی و دل زنجی که چه ز تنگی گیسو ددو زنجی که چه
 جانی

THESE verses cannot be easily translated; but the poet, in the first line, means to contrast the external form, with the mind or disposition of his mistress. The first is declared to be Grecian, for its beauty; the second to be Ethiopian, which indicates cruelty. "Go then," proceeds the poet "for this is not well; what has the form of a Grecian to do with the soul of an Ethiop?" The last line contains an admonition to his mistress, to endeavour at the attainment of uniform excellence, in mind as well as in form; (*رونگی گیسو*) and then proceeds to ask, "what she can propose to herself, in maintaining the contrast between her form and her mind?" This appears to me to be the meaning of

of the pronouns چه *What?* or چرا *Why?* as چُونِ كُنْتَم or چُونِ كُنْتَم
 "How, or what shall I do?" چَرَا زِدِي چُونِ كُنْتَم *I know*
 "came you to bear, or Why did you beat that man?" &c. **OF**
 its rhetorical application many examples might be adduced; but as
 these are common to the corresponding part of speech in other
 tongues, I shall merely insert the following; in which the interroga-
 tive چُونِ marks the impressive nature of the event compressed in
 the مَسْمُوتُ عَنْهُ.

بِه بِنِ بَهْرَامِ رَا نَا چُونِ كَرْدَمَ اَيْنِ زَمَانِ مَكُورَش

"BEHOLD BAHRAUM, how he is now swallowed up in the
 "grave!"

کِی *When?*

THE application of this word admits of no illustration by the
 rules of grammar; and I shall merely remark, that it may be occa-
 sionally governed by two or three prepositions; though the inser-
 tion of these seems to be optional only, but not necessary. Exam-
 ples: کِی رَفْتِی وَاَزْ کِی رَفْتِی "When did you go? or How long have
 "you been gone?" کِی خَوَاهِی رَفْتِ وَاَزْ کِی خَوَاهِی رَفْتِ
 "When shall you go?" &c. &c. &c.

OF its rhetorical application there are many examples, but the
 following gingle (in which the reiteration of the pronoun denotes
 the earnest desire, entertained by the speaker, for the arrival of
 that period of time, in which he shall enjoy the united pleasures
 of love, music, and wine,) will here suffice.

کِی بَاشَدُ وِکِی بَاشَدُ وِکِی بَاشَدُ وِکِی مَنِ بَاشَدُ وِکِی بَاشَدُ وِکِی بَاشَدُ وِکِی

کُجَ *Where? or Whither?*

"I CONCEIVE this word to be an obvious contraction for کُجَا مِ بَای
 "What

“What place?” It may be governed by the prepositions *آز*, *تا*, or *بر*, and also by the word *هر* Every; as *تا کجاست* or *تا کجاست* “Whether?” or “To what place?” *از کجاست* “Whence? or From what place?” *هر کجاست* “Wheresoever;” &c. The insertion of the preposition *از*, before the word *کجاست*, seems to be necessary; but the other prepositions are most commonly omitted. Examples: *از کجاست می آری* “Whence do you come?” *تا کجاست می روی* or *کجاست می روی* “Where are you going?” &c. &c.

THE rhetorical application of the word *کجاست* is of very common occurrence in the Persian language; but the following are the only examples of this kind, that need be adduced. First. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to mark the opposition existing between two or more objects, wholly dissimilar in their own nature. Example: *خیال زهد کجاست نشاء شراب کجاست* “It is one thing to practise piety, and another to indulge in the pleasures of wine.” Secondly. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to express his impatience, at the long continuance of the event comprised in the *مستقبل عنه*. Example: *تا کجاست مرا پریشان داری* “How long will you continue to render me miserable?” &c. &c. &c.

کُو Where?

THIS word is nearly synonymous with the word *کجاست*, but the examples of its occurrence are much less numerous in the Persian language. It never follows the prepositions *آز*, *تا*, or *بر*; nor is it commonly used, like the word *کجاست* in the strict and proper interrogative sense. On the contrary, its application is generally rhetorical; though some examples of the true interrogative application might be found or made: as *زید کُو* “Where is ZYDE?” “Where is AMR?” &c. &c. I believe this word to be almost exclusively in the possession of the poets; and of its rhetorical application

plication by them, the following example, in which it forms *the* *استقام انگاری* as already explained, will here suffice.

بگیرم که مار جو به کشدن جوخت کل مار کو زهر به دشمن دگومهر به دوست
خاقانی

" I GRANT that the *Maurchoba* may twist its body into the
" form of a snake; but where shall it find the poison with which
" to destroy its enemies; the jewel with which to reward its
" friends?"*

چند *How many* *

THIS word may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles ;
that is to say, it may form any given case without exception : as
بچند میفروشی " How many horses have you ? " چند آب داری
" For how much will you sell it ? " &c. &c. &c. It is said, that
the answer to the word چند according to its primitive acceptation,
ought not to be less than three or more than ten ; but this fact
I conceive to be doubtful, because there is no such restriction
in the present application of that word. The word چند is
not invariably interrogative : on the contrary it very often assumes
an informative sense ; as چند کیسه زردارم " I have so many purses
" of money ; " چند کتاب خریده ام " I have purchased a few
" books ; " &c. &c. In either of these cases, it may be followed
by the demonstrative nouns, which seem to bestow on it a super-
lative sense ; as چندان هست و جوی خواهی کرد " How long will

* The مار چوبه is a species of grass, so called, because it resembles a snake. Now the
snake is supposed, like Shakspeare's toad " ugly and venomous, " to wear " a precious jewel
in his head ; " and this jewel is signified by the word مهره in the second line. The poet
is speaking of those writers of his own time, who presumed to imitate the productions of
his pen ; and their ill success is compared to that of the مار چوبه ; which, says he, may
doubtless twist its body into the form of a snake, but cannot attain the essential properties
of that reptile ; being utterly destitute of poison with which to destroy its enemies, and
of jewels with which to reward its friends.

“ you seek it?” چندان بل دارم “ I have a great deal of
 “ money; ” چندین بار آوراکتتم “ How often have I told him; ”
 or “ I have told him very often; ” &c. The rhetorical ap-
 plication of this word is nearly the same with that of the
 other interrogative pronouns; and does not therefore stand in
 need of any illustration.

آیا

To the preceding interrogatives, the particle آیا is common-
 ly added; but there is little to be said of this particle, which
 is invariably interrogative, and cannot be used to form the voca-
 tive case. Like other interrogatives, it must govern a complete
 and perfect sentence; and cannot be followed by a single noun:
 as آیا زیده است یا غمیر “ Is ZYDE or AMR standing there? ”
 آیا زیده است “ Is ZYDE come? ” آیا زیده آمده است “ Is not ZYDE
 here? ” &c. &c. Of its rhetorical application there are many
 examples, but they are of too little importance to merit insertion.

THE preceding are all the observations I am enabled to offer
 on the use and application of the Persian pronouns, and I shall
 now proceed to the consideration of Persian nouns.

OF NOUNS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ایم ظرف

OR

NOUN OF TIME AND PLACE.

EVERY event must, of necessity, happen at a certain time and
 in a certain place; and hence all those nouns which are the
 names of any given time, or of any given space, have been
 termed

termed **ظُرُوف** or *Receptacles*, by the Persian Grammarians. a given substantive noun which is truly a **ظَرْف** by its own nature, such as **شَبّ** *The night*, **رُوز** *The day*, **ماه** *A month*, **سال** *A year*, **بَای** *A place*, &c. &c. will not be so termed in the language of syntax, unless it shall be employed to denote the time or the place in which a given event may happen to occur; and thus the word **خَانِه**, which is a **ظَرْف** in the following sentence **زَيْدُ خَانِهٖ خُوْد نَشِستِه است** "ZYDE is sitting in his own house," will cease to be a **ظَرْف**, when used to form the subject of a given proposition: as **خَانِهٖ مِنْ خُوْب است** "My house is good;" **خَانِهٖ شَبَّاه است** "Your house is bad;" &c.) because it does not, in this case, denote the name of the place in which an event is stated to occur. On the other hand, any given substantive noun occurring after any one of the **حُرُوفِ ظَرْفِيَه**, such as **دَر** *In*, **بِه** *In*, &c. &c. will be termed a **ظَرْف** in the language of grammar, without the least reference to the sense which it may happen to denote; and thus the word **فِكر** is said to be the **ظَرْف** in the following sentence, **دَر فِكر فَرُو ز فِتم** "I was lost in thought;" although it is obviously not the name of any given portion of time or space.

It may be inferred, therefore, that the nouns comprised under the term **ظَرْف** are naturally of two kinds; *first*, the **ظَرْفِ حَقِيقِي** or **PROPER ZURF**, which is invariably the name of a certain given time, or a certain given space; (or of some receptacle such as a *purse* in which is comprised a portion of space); and, *secondly*, the **ظَرْفِ مَجَازِي** or **IMPROPER ZURF**, which is not the name of any given time, or of any given space. But if a noun shall not be the name of any given time, or of any given space or receptacle, the insertion of the preposition, by which it should be governed, will be invariably necessary on every occasion; for the preposition **دَر** cannot be omitted in such examples as these, **دَر فِكر فَرُو ز فِتم** "I was lost in thought;" **دَر بَای كَرِفَتِه رَشِدَم** "I was involved in mi-

"sery

"fery;" &c. &c. and hence it happens, that the use of the **ظَرْفِ تَجَاوِزِ** or IMPROPER ZURF, is so perfectly simple, as to be wholly incapable of illustration by the rules of grammar.

ON the other hand, the insertion of the preposition, which ought to govern A PROPER ZURF, is sometimes optional; and sometimes necessary; and sometimes inadmissible; and it will be therefore the object of this chapter, to throw such lights on the insertion or omission of this preposition, as observation and enquiry have enabled me to procure. The subject, however, is not very easy; and the reader will do well, to add to the imperfect rules which I shall be able to offer, such farther aids as he can derive from the source of his own experience and practical knowledge.

BEFORE I proceed to detail the rules applicable to the insertion or omission of the preposition which ought to govern every **ظَرْف**, I think it necessary to detail the various classes, into which the words of this species have been divided by the Grammarians of Persia. Of these the first in order is the **ظَرْفِ زَمَان** or *noun of time*; as contradistinguished from the **ظَرْفِ مَكَان** or *noun of place*. And each of these is again divided into those which are **مُبْهَم** or *Indefinite*; as opposed to those which are **مَوْقُوت** or **مَحْدُود**; that is to say, *Bounded*; the former term being applicable to nouns of time, and the latter being applicable to nouns of place.

A ZURF is said to be *bounded*, when it denotes the name of any limited portion of time or space; but the word "limited" is here used in a sense which will be best understood by adverting to an example. Let it be granted that the idea signified by the word *night* includes the whole of that portion of time, during which the sun is below the horizon; and it may be affirmed in that case, that the night is, of necessity, bounded at both extremes

termines by the rising and setting of the sun. On this principle, the word شب *The night*, is termed a نَظَرِ زَمَانِ مَوْقُت by the Persian Grammarians; and so also the word خانه *A house*, is termed a نَظَرِ مَكَانِ مَحْدُود; because every house must be somewhere bounded by its own walls.

BUT the ideas signified by the words وقت *Time*, جای *Place*, پیش *Before*, پس *Behind*, &c. &c. have not of necessity any bounds; and these words being indefinitely applicable to all time and all space, or to any given portion of time and space, are therefore termed طُرُوفِ مُتَمَمَّة by the Persian Grammarians*. There is a farther division of the طُرُوف into those which are مُتَقَابِلَة or *Moveable*, on the one hand, as جام *A cup*; کيس *A purse*; &c. &c. and into those which are قَبْرِ مُتَقَابِلَة or *Immoveable*, on the other hand, as چاه *A well*; خانه *A house*; and other examples of the same nature.

It must be obvious to every reader that the preceding division of the طُرُوف is wholly unimportant in its own nature; and that the utility of its adoption must therefore depend on the facility with which it may enable the reader, to determine the propriety of omitting or inserting the preposition by which every طُرُوف (according to the grammatical acceptation of that term) ought to be governed. Even in this point of view, I am by no means convinced that the arrangement which I have adopted (for want of a better) will obtain with the approbation of the European reader; and it is not without considerable diffidence, that I submit to his attention the following rules.

* Let us suppose one body to be at rest, and another to be moving before it in a straight line. In this case, the moving body will still be in the *front* or *before* the object at rest, though the motion of the former were to endure forever. It is obvious, therefore, that the words *before*, *behind*, *above*, *below*, *right*, *left*, &c. belong to the class of the طُرُوفِ مُتَمَمَّة as explained in the text.

R U L E F I R S T.

A ظرف زمان موقت may be مخصوص or *specific*, by its own nature, as in the case of اکنون Now; or At this time; فردا Tomorrow; or The coming day; هنوز Yet; or Up to this time; همیشه Always; or At all times; هرگز Never; or At no time; &c. And in this case, it seldom admits the insertion of any preposition. Examples: اکنون میروم "I am going now;" فردا خواهم رفت "I shall go tomorrow;" I have "I have not seen him yet;" همیشه بنده خود را خیر دار "Let your intentions be always virtuous;" این کار هرگز نکن "Never do this;" &c. &c. &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

OR being naturally indefinite, (as in the case of the word شب which is applicable to any one night as well as to another,) the preposition will yet be most commonly omitted, *first*, if the ظرف shall follow the demonstrative noun; as امشب رسیدم "I arrived to night;" *secondly*, if it shall follow the words چند or هر as چند روز ترا خشم "I fought you for several days;" *thirdly*, if it shall follow a noun of number; as دو سال خدمتش کردم "I served him for two years;" *fourthly*, if it shall be followed by a relative pronoun; as روزی که ذره شود امشب خوان من "Even when my bones shall be mouldered away, my heart will yet preserve its love for thee;" and, *finally*, if it shall be followed by a substantive noun in the genitive case; as روز قیامت "On the day of judgment;" شب معراج "On the night of the ascension;" (MOHAMMUD'S ascension into heaven on the beast براق) &c. &c. In most of the examples of this kind, the preposition may however be inserted, according to the pleasure of every speaker:

as *بهر روز قیامت* ; *تشیب میراج* ; and other examples of the same nature.

RULE THIRD.

If a *ظرف زمان موقت*, being naturally indefinite, shall not be rendered specific in the manner described in the preceding rule, the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly inserted. Examples : *که در شب هر چه گم کرد*. *شب گرد است تا وانش* "The watchman " is responsible for what is lost in the night." But the omission of the preposition is also very common : Examples : *شب چو عتید نماز می بندم* "A night when I prepare to pray;" *چه خورد با دراد فرزندانم* "What will my children eat in the morning;" &c. And if the *ظرف* shall be rendered specific by the context, that is to say, if it shall appear, by the context, to be applicable to a specified or a given time (whether past, present, or future with reference to the speaker,) the preposition will then be generally omitted, even though the *ظرف* may not be accompanied by any adjective, or by a substantive noun. Examples : *سهر آمدیم باوایت*. *بشکار رفت بودی* "I repaired to your house in the " morning, (that is to say, in the morning of the day in which " I now speak) but you were gone a hunting;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

If a *ظرف زمان مبهم* shall be rendered specific by the sense of its attributive ; that is to say, by the sense of an adjective, or by the following substantive noun, or by the member of a sentence with which it is connected ; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly omitted. Example : *هنگام تنگ دشنی در پیش کوشش و مستی* "In the season of " poverty strive to be happy;" &c. &c. But many instances of the contrary might be easily adduced. Example : *بوقت بیگم جز سایه من نیست یار من* "In the season of distress " I am deserted by every body but my own shadow."

RULE

RULE FIFTH.

If a ظرف زمان مبهم shall not be rendered specific in the manner described in the preceding rule; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly inserted. Example: در دهر که گشت بختی حجب "Who is there in the world (literally, "in time) without a fault."

RULE SIXTH.

If a ظرف مکان مبهم shall be rendered specific by its attributive; that is to say, by an adjective, or by the following substantive noun, or by the member of a sentence with which it is connected; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly omitted. Examples: این جا رسیدم "I arrived here;" من در آن جا دویدم "I run thither;" بر تو در چه کردی "What did you do without the door;" که در تو در درانی "That you should be admitted within;" &c. Indeed the words بالا Above; زیر Below; پیش Before; پس Behind; and some others which have been commonly assigned to the class of the ظرف مکان مبهم, seldom admit the insertion of any preposition, even when they happen to stand alone.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE preposition must be generally inserted before every ظرف زمان محدود whether it shall be specific or indefinite, according to the sense of these terms, as already explained in the preceding rules. Examples: بخانه می روم "I am going home;" در خانه شما کیست "Who is there in your house?" یارم در کلبه رسید "My friend arrived in Calcutta;" &c. &c. But some examples of the contrary may be heard in conversation, though they seldom occur in written composition: as خانه می روم "I am going

“ going home ;” *مِنَ مَدِينَتِي رَوَمَ* “ I am going to Calcutta ;” &c. If the *نَظَرُ* shall be of the class termed *مُتَقِل*, as already explained, the insertion of the preposition is indispensably necessary. Example: *أَبَ دَرِ كُوزِه رِخْتَمَ* “ I poured water into the “ pitcher ;” &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding are all the rules of Persian syntax, which seem to me to have any relation to the insertion or omission of the preposition that ought to govern every *نَظَرُ*. It results from these rules, that the insertion or omission of that preposition depends, in a great measure, on the specific or indefinite sense of the *نَظَرُ*, which may happen to be employed on a given occasion. For if the word *شَب* *The night*, for example, shall be so employed as to be exclusively applicable to some one or more nights, as opposed to all the other nights in the year; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly omitted; (*سَهَبِي تَارُوزِ خُشْتِه بُوَدَمَ*) without the least reference to the *means*, by which the indefinite and general sense of that word has been thus restricted. And if the same word shall continue, in the context, to retain that indefinite and general sense which belongs to every generic noun before its restriction to individuals by the means of definitives, or by any other means; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly inserted: as *دَرِ شَبِ بُرْجِ گَمِ كَرْدُو* “ Whatever is lost in the night ;” (that is to say in *any night*) and other examples of the same nature. I now proceed to consider the nature of **GENERIC NOUNS** and the manner in which those general terms are so restricted, as to be significant of the individuals composing a species.

CHAPTER SECOND.

اسم جنس

OR

GENERIC NOUNS.

WITH the exception of proper names, all the nouns that enter into the composition of every language may be accurately comprised under the class of generic nouns or general terms. These general terms denote the name of a given species or a given genus, as *مَرُوم* *Man*; *اَسَب* *The horse*; *مِوَه* *Fruit*; *وَانَه* *Grains*; *رَوُوعَن* *Oil*; *رَبَاب* *Sand*; *عِلْم* *Knowledge*; *بِر* *Virtue*; &c. &c. &c. They are naturally divided into those which denote *material objects* whether animate or not; as *مَرُوم* *Man*; *سَنَك* *Stone*; &c. and into those which denote *the name of an event*; as *عِلْم* *Knowledge*; *بِر* *Virtue*; and other examples of the same nature. A generic noun of the first class may be applicable to all the parts of a given substance; as *آب* *Water*; *سِوَم* *Silver*; or it may not be applicable to any part which is less than the whole; as in the case of the word *Man*; which has been defined to signify *the name of a certain reasoning animal*; and consequently cannot be applicable to the various parts, which enter into the composition of man's corporal frame.

A GENERIC noun may denote *the name of the species as opposed to the individuals of which it is composed*; and in this sense of the term it may be accurately affirmed that "*Man never dies*;" or that "*The king never dies*;" because the species continues to survive, though each individual must perish in his turn. Or it may denote *collectively the whole body of individuals composing the members of a given species*; as when we affirm that "*Man is mortal*;" or that "*Man must die*;" which is an assertion (in this sense of the term)

term) perfectly consistent with the former. It may further denote *the name of a species without reference to any condition whatever*; and this happens when a given proposition shall be at once true of the species itself, and also of the individuals comprised under it: as when we affirm that "The three angles of *the plane triangle* are equal to two right angles;" a proposition which is obviously true, whether it shall be understood to signify *the species itself*, on the one hand, or *the individuals*, on the other hand, which are comprised under it.* A generic noun, by the assistance of *articles* and other *definitives*, and by the variations of *number*, &c. &c. may be also restricted so as to denote *any one or more individuals, composing the members of a given species*; as when we speak of *that man*; or *those women*; *any man*; or *many women*; and other examples of the same nature.

A GENERIC noun is said to be مُشَرَّفٌ or DEFINITE *first*, when it denotes the name of the species without reference to any condition whatever: as "The three angles of *the plane triangle* are equal to two right angles;" *secondly*, when it denotes the name of the species as opposed to the individuals of which it is composed; as "Man never dies;" *thirdly*, when it denotes collectively the whole body of individuals composing the members of a given species; as "Man is mortal;" and *finally*, when it denotes any one or more individuals opposed to all the other members of a given species; as "Shew me *the man*;" "Give me *the books*;" and other examples of the same nature. It is said to be مُشَرَّفٌ or INDEFINITE when it denotes, indifferently, any one or more individuals among many others of the same class; as "Give me a wafer;" that is to say, *any wafer*; "Buy me a horse of a given description;" that is to say, "Buy me *any horse* that may happen to fall under a given descrip-

* That the proposition in the text is true of the individuals will be at once admitted by every reader. That it is also true of the species, considered without reference to the individuals comprised under it, follows of necessity from the following consideration: *namely*, that it would continue to be true, though there were no such thing as an individual plane triangle to be found in nature.

"tion." If it be affirmed, therefore, that "A friend called on me this morning," the word *friend* will be here *definite*; because it is intended to be applicable to *one* individual, as opposed to every other individual of the same class. In this case the letter *یا* or *Ya* of unity will be generally added to the word signifying a friend in the Persian language; and if that word be truly indefinite, as in the following example "Would I had a friend (that is to say any friend) to advise with on this occasion," the same letter will be generally added, under the denomination of *یا* or *The indefinite Ya*.

THE absence of the letter *یا* from any given generic noun, is alone sufficient to determine the *definite* character of that noun according to the several acceptations of the word *مُتَرَق* or *DEFINITE*, as already explained. There are, however, some verbal definitives; such as *آن* *That*; and, *این* *This*; *هر* *Every*; *همه* *All*; &c. &c. any one of which may of course be employed as occasion requires. The following are all the rules which I have been able to collect in the language regarding the use and application of Persian generic nouns; and these rules are equally applicable (unless in certain cases which will be duly noticed) as well to those nouns which denote the name of an event, as to those which denote the name of a substance.*

R U L E F I R S T.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a species unrestricted by attributives of any kind, will be invariably used in the singular number; and has no occasion for any definitive. Examples: *مَشَهَوَتِ آتش است از و بر حذر باید بود* "Lust is fire, beware of it;" *آز نفس پرور شمر نیاید* "Know-

* I think it necessary to state that every Persian adjective or compound epithet which may supply in its absence the place of a given substantive noun (as *مردِ سفاک* for *سفاک*) will be considered by me as a generic noun.

"ledge or Skill is not to be expected from the indolent man;"
(literally, from the *self-cherisher*) *وَلَيْسَ سِرُّوَرِي رَا نَشَايدَ*

"And the unskilful or ignorant man is unfit to command."

سَقْلَه چُو جَاه آمَدُو بِيَم وَرَزَشَش "When the man of low habits
"has risen to rank and wealth," *سَقْلِي خَوَاهَد بَقَرُورَت سَرَشَش*

"He will deserve (by his conduct) to be well kicked."

(Literally, *his head will certainly require a cuffing*.)

پَدَر رَا عَسَل بَشِيَارَا سَت "Fathers have much honey;" (or in-

dulgence) *وَلَيْكِن پَسَر گَرْمِي دَارَا سَت* "But children are

hot-headed." *وَاَنَا چُون طَبْخَه عَقْطَارَا سَت خَامُوشِش وَنَمُوشِش* "The

"wise man resembles the box of the perfumer,

"dispensing its fragrance, (shewing his skill) in silence;"

وَاَنَا دَان چُون طَبْخِلِ خَا زِي بَلَنْدِ آوازَه وَبِيَانِ نَهِي "And the ignorant

"man resembles the warlike drum, noisy but empty."

&c. &c.

REMARKS.

I CONCEIVE that all the generic nouns, employed in these examples, are intended to denote the name of the species; or to be generally, that is to say collectively, applicable to all the individuals comprised under it. And hence they have not the least occasion for any definitive, nor is it necessary to put them into the plural number; though the idiom of our language frequently requires the use of that number, in such cases. Thus the word *پَدَر*, in the example *پَدَر رَا عَسَل بَشِيَارَا سَت*, must be translated by the plural number; and if we should employ the singular number in order to convey the same idea, (as *the father*, that is to say, the species of nouns comprised under the term *father* has much indulgence) it would no doubt be an offence against idiom; which might, however, be defended on the principles of analogy. For it may doubtless be accurately affirmed in our language that "The *horse* has many useful properties;" and as the word *horse*, in the singular number, is here used to denote the name of a species;

so there can be no reason but that of idiom, why the word *father* should not be also used in the same number, in order to denote the name of a species. The word *horse* cannot, however, be so used in our language without an article; whereas the Persians never employ an article in such cases. But if we substitute the word *man* for the word *horse*, (as "Man is an animal") the article will also disappear in our language; and as there cannot, in this case, be any good reason for withholding from the *man* what we give to the *horse* (or vice versa) so it must be thence inferred that the use of articles is greatly abused in our language. It would have been much more consistent to give or to withhold the article from both; and the latter is the plan which has been adopted in the Persian Language.

R U L E S E C O N D.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a species restricted by attributives of any kind, will be invariably used in the singular number; and has no occasion for any definitive. Examples: *مردی مروت زن است* "The man without humanity is (no better than) a woman;" *وزاید باطیح رهن* "And the covetous devotee is a robber." *عالم ناپرهیزگار کور است مفتاح دار* "The learned man who does not abstain from sin is like the blind man who carries a torch in his hand." *فربیب دشمن مخور* "Be not blind to the wiles of your enemies;" *و غرور مداح تحسر* "And beware of the pride inspired by the flatterer;" *که آن دام زرقی نهاده* "For the one has spread the snare of hypocrisy;" *و این کایم طمع عشا ده* "And the other has opened the mouth of avidity."

R E M A R K S.

In all these examples, the generic nouns are restricted by a certain attributive; as when we say in English "The wise man" or

" or *The man of wisdom* speaks little." The general (I do not say the universal) effect of this attributive will be to exclude from the significance of the generic noun, certain objects to which, in its utmost latitude, it would be obviously applicable; as when we say, with reference to the preceding example, that *fools* are excluded by the epithet *wise*. This exclusion having taken place, the rest of mankind will form, by themselves, a given species; of which a Persian is at liberty to affirm or deny whatever he pleases, without having recourse to the aid of articles; and without the assistance of the plural number. I shall here observe by the way, that the plural number of every generic noun denotes the *individuals* and not the *species*; for though it may be truly affirmed that "the *King* never dies;" the same assertion would be utterly false when applied to *Kings*. It follows, therefore, that a given proposition must be true of the *individuals*, before the predicate can be accurately ascribed to a given *subject* in the plural number; and that the predicate may be accurately ascribed to the same subject in the singular number, whenever it is true of the species, with or without reference to the individuals of which it is composed: as "*Man* is mortal;" "*Man* never dies;" and other examples of the same nature.

R U L E T H I R D.

A GENERIC noun may be followed by the letter *وَحَدَّثَ* or *Ta of Unity*; in which case, it will be applicable to some one individual; as opposed to every other individual of the same class. Example: *دُرُویشی بمقامی رسید که صاحب آن بقعه کریم النفس بود*. "A Durveish arrived at a certain place, the master of which was of a generous disposition." The generic noun, being thus restricted at the beginning of a discourse, may be afterwards employed (without an adjunct of any kind) to denote the name of the *same* individual, in every part of the subsequent narrative. Example: *دُرُویشی بمقامی رسید که صاحب آن بقعه کریم النفس بود و درویش* *نموده*.

A durveish arrived
 " at a certain place, the master of which was of a
 " generous disposition. The durveish had travelled over the
 " desert, and was very weary and very hungry."

R E M A R K S.

THE word درویش is the generic noun referred to in this rule; and the reader will perceive, that after being so restricted by the letter یای وحدت or *Tu of unity* at the beginning of the narrative, as to be applicable only to a single individual, it is subsequently employed to denote the same individual, without the aid of any adjunct.

R U L E F O U R T H.

OR supposing the generic noun to be so restricted at the beginning of the discourse, as to be applicable to two or more individuals, then *each* of these individuals may be accurately typified, in every subsequent part of the narrative, by any given generic noun without exception, which shall appear by the context to be descriptive of them. The generic nouns so used will be wholly independent of any adjunct.

E X A M P L E.

دو امیرزاده بودند یکی علم آموخت و دیگری مال اندوخت آن ملامت
 عصر شد و این عزیز مصر گشت پس تو انکر بچشم حقارت و رفقیه
 نظر کردی و گفستی من بسلطنت رسیدم و تو همچنان در مسکنت بماندی
 گفت ای برادرشکر نعمت باری تعالی بر من است که میراث پیغمبران
 یافتیم یعنی علم و تو میراث فرعون و فامان یعنی مالک مصر

" THERE were two brothers (persons) of a noble family,
 " one of whom studied the sciences, while the other pursued
 " the

“ the road to wealth. The one became the most learned
 “ man of his age, and the other ascended the throne of
 “ Egypt. *The rich man* used to look on *the man of learning*
 “ with an eye of contempt; and he would tell him, I have
 “ attained the rank of sovereignty, while you have remained
 “ in a state of poverty. My brother, replied the poor man,
 “ I am bound to be grateful for the bounty of God, who
 “ has conferred on me the inheritance of the prophets,
 “ namely, knowledge; while you have obtained the inheri-
 “ tance of PHAROAH, and (his minister) HAMAUN; that is
 “ to say, the kingdom of Egypt.”

R E M A R K S.

THE generic nouns referred to in this example are the words
 تَوَانِكُر and فَيَقِيه, which are obviously descriptive of the two
 brothers. Of the cases stated in the third and fourth rules,
 it is proper to observe, that *the demonstrative noun* or *any*
other definitive, such as مَذْكُور, مَرْتَبُور, &c. may accurately
 precede the generic noun when occasion requires. Thus
 تَوَانِكُر مَرْتَبُور, دَوَانِش مَذْكُور, اَن فَيَقِيه, اَن تَوَانِكُر, اَن دَر وِش
 and other expressions of the same nature, may be often observed
 in the Persian language in such cases; yet the presence of the
 demonstrative noun or of any other definitive is seldom necessary
 to the perspicuity of the sentence, and its omission is generally
 more elegant than its insertion in my opinion.

R U L E F I F T H.

ANY one or more objects, being familiar to the mind of
 the speaker, and also to the mind of the party addressed,
 will be sufficiently defined by the generic name, which does
 not, in this case, require an adjunct. Examples: پادشاه رسيده
 “ The King arrived; ” دَر بَاَزَار دَر اِيْدَم “ I entered the mar-
 “ ket; ” كِتَاب بَر مِزْبَانِ كَذَا شَت “ Put *that* book on *the*
 “ table; ” &c.

M m

REMARKS.

REMARKS.

Of these examples it may be observed, that the *King* is known because there is generally but one individual in a whole nation, to whom that term can be accurately applied; and that the *book*, the *market*, and the *table* are known, because the party addressed is aware that we have previously had occasion to read the one, to frequent the other, or to write at the third. The application of this rule is very extensive; and it is clearly impossible to define the infinite number of circumstances, which may tend to convince the speaker that an individual object then present to his mind, being also familiar to the mind of the party addressed, will be at once recognised by its generic name.

RULE SIXTH.

If a given generic noun shall not be otherwise defined by the context, its definite character may yet be inferred from the persons of any given verb to which it belongs. Examples: "ZYDE is a handsome and a good man;" زید مردی است خوب صورت و نیک بخت
 "He was always doing good to his father and mother;" همواره با پدر و مادر ایشان کردی
 "And conducted himself to his brothers and his friends with indulgence and kindness;" و بابرادران و دوستان بمواسات و ماطفقت پیش آمدی
 "And acted with civility to his enemies;" و با دشمنان طریقی مدارا میمودی
 "And taught morality to his children;" &c. &c. In all these examples, the generic nouns are sufficiently defined by the person of the verbs to which they belong; and the introduction of the word خود, after each generic noun, as دوستان خود, پدر و مادر خود, &c. &c. though certainly admissible, would yet be inelegant in my opinion. So, also, in the following examples: "Thanks to heaven I arrived at the place of

of my nativity ; ” وَأَمَّ أَقْرَبًا رَأَيْتُ بَاتِمَ
 “ relations well ; ” وَزَيَّارَتِ بَدْرُو مَادِرِ نَمُودَم
 “ father and mother ; ” وَأَمَّ لَمَّا غَابَتْ بَرَادِرَانِ جَنِّمِ مَشْفَاقِي رَأَيْتُ بَنِي وَادَمِ
 “ And satisfied my anxious eyes with the sight of my brothers ; ”
 “ And rejoiced my heart by the sight of my children ; ” &c. &c. &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

If a generic noun shall be employed to denote the whole body of individuals composing the members of a given species, it may be put into the plural number ; or it may follow the words هَر Every, or اَمَّ All or Every, &c. Examples :
 “ Devotees desire the reward of their worship.” عَابِدَانِ جَزَائِ طَاعَتِ خَوَاهِنْد
 “ Every man is enchanted with his own ideas ; ” هَر كَسِ نَجَبِ بِلِ خَوْبِشِ خَطِي وَارِد
 “ Every man believes (or All men believe) in the excellence of his (or their) own understanding ; ” &c. After the word هَر the demonstrative noun اِن That, or the letter بَايِ وَحَرَتِ or يَا of unily may be given to the following substantive noun. Examples :
 “ Every man who ; ” هَر كَسِ (for هَر كَسِيه) هَر كَسِيه or هَر اِن كَسِيه
 &c. &c. And the letter بَا may be added to nouns in the plural number ; more especially if these shall be followed by the
 “ as ; ” وَجِهَر بَايِيه وَكَسِيه بَايِيه : اِسْمِ مَوْصُولِ &c.

R U L E E I G H T H.

It has already been stated that every generic noun may denote the name of a given species with reference to all the individuals comprised under it ; as “ Man is mortal,” or “ Man must die.” And as that which is true of all the individuals must be also true of every individual, so it may be accurately affirmed of the species itself (when used in this sense of the term) as “ Man is mortal ; ” or of every

every individual comprised under it; as "*All Men are mortal*;" "*Every Man is mortal*;" and other examples of the same nature. This rule, being founded in reason and the nature of things, must be generally applicable to every language. Examples: *وَأَمَّا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ عِطَارٌ رَاسِتٌ* "*The wife man resembles the box of the perfumer*;" *وَأَمَّا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ عِطَارٌ رَاسِدٌ* "*Wife men resemble the box of the perfumer*;" &c. &c.

R U L E N I N T H.

IF a generic noun shall be employed to denote the name of some one individual, as opposed to every other individual of the same class, it will be generally followed, on its first occurrence in a given discourse, by the letter *وَحَرَّت* *Yā of unity*.

Example: *اِشْتَرَيْتُ اسْبِي خَرِيدَةً وَبَرَّانَ بَرَّتْ سَنَهُ فَرَسِي رَاهَ رَقْتَمِ* "I bought a horse to-day, and having mounted him, I rode to the distance of one furlong." It has already been stated in

R U L E T H I R D, that the generic noun, being thus restricted at the beginning of a discourse, may be afterwards employed to denote the same individual in every subsequent part of the narrative, without the aid of any adjunct. It may now be added that the adjunct is sometimes (though rarely) omitted at the beginning of the discourse. Example: *كَيْسِي فَرَسْتَادَمَ* for *كَيْسِي فَرَسْتَادَمَ* "I sent one or more persons." And that the poets, for some reason which is altogether beyond my comprehension, have not unfrequently employed the demonstrative noun *آن* *That*, in the sense of the letter *وَحَرَّت* *Yā of unity*, at the beginning of a discourse.

E X A M P L E S.

آن جوانمرد زنی زیب داشت خانه دل بچنانش آراست

جامی

"A CERTAIN youth had a handsome wife, whose image filled the chamber of his heart."

آن

آن اعرابی بشتر فایده در شیری باو به شد تر شد گز
جامی

"AN Arabian, satisfied with his milk and his camels, prepared to travel in a certain desert."

R U L E T E N T H.

If a generic noun shall be employed in a sense truly indefinite, that is to say, if it shall be indifferently applicable to any one among all the individuals composing the members of a given species, it will then be generally followed by the letter *یای شکر* or the *indefinite Ya*.

E X A M P L E.

سگی را لقمه هرگز فراموش نگردد و زنی صد توبیش ست
و گز شیر می نوازی سقاه را بگشتر چشیری آید با تو در جنگ

"A dog will never forget the mouthful which he has received from your hands, however severely you may treat him afterwards: an unworthy mind will receive your benefactions for an age, and afterwards quarrel with you for the merest trifle."

In the preceding example, the reader will perceive that *سگ* supplies the place of the letter *یا*, after words ending with the *gentle aspirate*: as *لقمه* و *سقاه* &c.

R E M A R K S.

Or the case stated in the tenth rule, it ought to be remarked that every thing which is indifferently true of any one, among all the individuals composing the members of a given species, must be also true of the species itself, and of all the individuals comprised under it. Accordingly, the word *سگ*, in the preceding example,

N n

ample,

ample, might be accurately employed in the singular number without the aid of any adjunct; (سگ را نغمه برگز فراموش نگردد) and it will denote, in this case the name of the species: or it might be accurately employed in the plural number; (سگهان را نغمه فراموش نگردد) and it will denote, in this case, all the individuals composing the species. So also in the English language; as "Dogs, or A dog, or The dog, will never forget the morsel, which he has, or they have, received from your hands," &c. This remark is nearly the same in substance, with that which has already appeared on the SEVENTH RULE.

R U L E E L E V E N T H.

By a figure of speech the letter *l* may denote that sort of unity, which belongs to an individual highly distinguished for his merit, learning, &c. above other individual of the same class.

Example: زید مردی است در علم "ZYDE is a man for his learning." The English article *a* is used by SHAKESPEAR in the same sense: as "Nature might stand up, and say to all the world *This was a man.*"

R U L E T W E L F T H.

A GIVEN generic noun, being employed to denote the name of an event, will generally preserve the singular number, when followed by a plural substantive noun. Examples: نعمت بزرگان

"The favors of the great." عیب گرفتن "The censure

"of the critics." عشوه محبوبان "The glances of our sweet

"hearts." ستم پادشاهان "The tyranny of kings." &c.

But the plural number may yet be often assumed: as عشوای محبوبان, and many other examples of the same nature,

R U L E T H I R T E E N T H.

A GIVEN generic noun being applicable to all the parts of a given

given substance, as آب *Water*, سنگ *Stone*, &c. will seldom require the plural number when followed by a plural substantive noun. Examples: آب انبار "The water of the rivulets;" گوشت حیوانات "The flesh of animals;" خرماي درختان "The dates of the trees;" &c. Or, if the second substantive noun shall denote the name of a place in which the sense of the first abounds, both nouns may then preserve the singular number. Examples: آب دريا "The water of the sea, or of the river;" خرماي درخت "The dates of the trees;" برگ درخت "The leaves of the trees;" &c. The assumption of the plural number by the first of these two nouns is, however, a common occurrence; and, like the word *oils* in our language, the first noun will be generally found, in that case, to denote the various *species* comprised under a given genus which it was formed to denote. Examples: خرماهاي درخت "The dates of the trees;" سبزههاي باغ "The herbs of the garden;" &c. &c. &c.

R U L E F O U R T E E N T H.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a living creature, will generally assume the plural number, when followed by a given substantive noun denoting the name of a place in which the sense of the first abounds. Examples: مرغان باغ "The birds of the garden;" پرندگان هوا "The birds of the air;" حیوانات جنگل "The beasts of the forest;" حشرات زمین "The reptiles or creeping things of the earth;" &c.

R U L E F I F T E E N T H.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of an inanimate object, will generally preserve the singular number when followed by a plural substantive noun. Examples: چشم بد اندیشان "The eyes of the malignant;" دست مظلومان "The hands of the oppressed;" زبان حرف گران "The tongues of the noisy;" &c. &c. &c.

“ of censurers;” خانه زُرکایا “The houses of subjects.” Or, if the first noun shall be put into the plural number, the second will often preserve the singular number; but both may frequently assume the plural, and both may often preserve the singular. Examples: خانه درویش or خانه درویشان or خانه های درویش or خانه های درویشان “The houses of the poor;” &c.

THE reader will observe, that the generic nouns noticed in this rule are not applicable to any part of a given substance which is less than the whole; whereas those noticed in RULE THIRTEENTH are applicable to all the parts of a given substance.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now to remark that a given species cannot be destroyed otherwise than by the destruction of all the individuals of which it is composed; for if one man only were left alive in the world, the species would continue to exist in that individual. And hence it follows that a plurality of individuals is by no means necessary to the existence of a species; or, in other words, that a given substantive noun, which is employed to denote a GENERAL IDEA, will therefore be truly a generic noun; though it may not be applicable, in point of fact, to more than one individual object. To explain by an example. The word SUN is usually applicable to a single object; because there is but one sun in our system; but if instead of one we had five hundred suns, I conceive that the term SUN denotes a general idea (namely, that of a luminous body performing certain specific functions) which would render it accurately applicable to them all. In this case the word SUN is not a proper name but a generic noun; and to the class of generic nouns it has been assigned, accordingly, by the Persian Grammarians. The word PERSIA, on the other hand, denotes no general idea; and is merely the proper name of an individual country, which cannot be applied to other countries. The word *Persia* is therefore truly a proper name.

I SHALL

I SHALL here notice that Sir WILLIAM JONES seems to have mistaken the true nature of generic nouns, when, speaking of the expressions *مگل چیدن* or *مگل را چیدن*, he translates the first by the words *To gather a (or any) flower*; and the second by the words *To gather the (given or particular) flower*; ascribing this imaginary difference in the sense of the examples, to the omission or insertion of the termination *را*. Both these expressions are perfectly synonymous in my opinion; and the meaning of both is merely this: *To gather that species of external objects which is known in Persian by the term مگل*. And as it has already been stated that a given species exists as perfectly in one flower as in five hundred, so it may be accurately affirmed of any individual that *he gathered the species*, (*مگل را چید* or *مگل چید*) whether he has gathered one or many flowers.

FROM all that has been said in the preceeding rules, it follows that articles and definitives of every kind are very sparingly employed in the Persian Language.

CHAPTER THIRD.

SECTION FIRST.

مَم

OR

PROPER NAMES.

THE application of proper names is incapable of illustration by the rules of grammar; and I shall merely observe, on this subject, that an *مَم* or PROPER NAME is defined to be the name of an individual object; and that the Persians have divided all proper names into three classes: *first*, those which are merely proper names, as *زید* و *عمر* &c. *secondly*, those termed *لقب* or TITLES; which convey praise or censure; as *محمّد اسلام*

O o

محمّد الدین

كُنَيْت or كُنَيْتَات &c. and *thirdly*, those termed **PATRONYMIC NAMES**; in which the words *father, son, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, mother, daughter, &c.* govern the following substantive noun in the genitive case: as **أَبُو عَمْرٍو**; **أُمُّ كَلْبُومٍ**; **وَابْنُ الْخَرَّصِ** and other examples of the same nature.

SECTION SECOND.

أَسْمَاءُ عَدَدٍ

OR

NOUNS OF NUMBER.

THERE is little to be said on the application of these nouns to the purposes of speech. They are broken into fractions, by prefixing to the numerator the denominator; as **أَرْبَعُونَ** *One fourth*; **عَشْرُونَ** *One tenth*; **مِائَتُونَ** *One hundredth part*; &c. And the ordinals are generally formed from the cardinal numerals, by adding the letter **م** *quiescent* after the vowel **ن**: as **أَوَّلٌ** *First*; **ثَوْنٌ** or **ثَوْنِي** *Second*; **ثَلَاثٌ** *Third*; **أَرْبَعٌ** *Fourth*; **عَشْرٌ** *Tenth*; **ثَلَاثِي** *Thirtieth*; **أَرْبَعِي** *Fortieth*; &c. &c. The substantive must generally follow the **أَسْمَاءُ عَدَدٍ** and will preserve invariably the singular number. Examples: **عَشْرٌ رُجُلٌ** *Ten men*; **خَمْسٌ خَيْلٌ** *Five horses*; **أَرْبَعٌ شَجَرٌ** *Four trees*; &c. But the **أَسْمَاءُ عَدَدٍ** may sometimes be observed to follow the substantive; as **سَلَى دَوْبَرَيْنِ بَرَأْنَدٍ** "Two years passed after this;" though such examples are very rare.

SECTION THIRD.

أَسْمَاءُ جَمْعٍ

OR

COLLECTIVE NOUNS.

THESE nouns most commonly govern a verb in the singular number; but the verb may assume the plural according to the option of every speaker.

EXAMPLES.

EXAMPLES.

بفرمود که جای جُشد بپاه

“ He gave orders that the army should move.”

بپاه از دو موصف بپاراستند رزمبران به پنجبر خاستند

“ THE army on both sides drew up in order of battle ;

“ THE warriors prepared to seize their prey.”

SECTION FOURTH.

کِنایات

THERE are a few words in the Persian language, which are known to Grammarians by the term کِنایات. The term کِنایه signifies *concealment*; and the words to which I have alluded are distinguished by that term, because the significance of these words is supposed to be obscure. The word چَشد, for example, is the name of an unknown number which cannot be less than *three* or more than *nine*; and as this uncertainty of the number constitutes an essential or inherent part of the idea signified by the word چَشد, so this word has been *therefore* assigned to the class of the کِنایات as already explained. The word چَشد signifies *A few*; and is, in fact, synonymous with اند, اشد, or اشدند; though the three last words are now nearly or entirely obsolete in the Persian language. The other words known by the term کِنایات are *first*, تِلْآن Such a one; or *A certain person or thing*; together with its synonymous و بَتَنار (sometimes written بَتَنار) and بَتَنان or بَتَنان and, *secondly*, تِلْآن رُچَنان و چَچَنان کُشَم as “ I said such and such things to such and such a person ;” &c. The application of the کِنایات is wholly incapable of illustration by the rules of Grammar; and I shall merely adduce two examples.

ples, to shew the occurrence of the letters **يَا** معروف و مجهول after the word **فَمَنْ** that being the only circumstance regarding these words, which requires to be noticed in this place.

وَلَمَّا كَانَ رَوْزِ نَرَادُشْمَنِ جَانِي دَانِشْت كِه تَرَا يَا رُقْسَه يِي وَفَسَه يِي دَانِشْت
واقف

" My heart then discovered you to be its mortal enemy when
" it found that you were the beloved of such and such persons."

شَاهِدِ اَنْ نِشْت كِه مَوِي وَ مِيَانِي دَا رُو بَسَدَه طَلْعَتِ اَنْ بَاشِ كِه اِنِّي دَا رُو
رَبُوهُ حَوْرِ دِهَرِي خُوب وَ طَيْفِ اسْتِ دِلِي خُوبِي اَنْسْت وَ طَافَتِ كِه فَسَه يِي دَا رُو
حافظ

THOUGH the meaning of these verses cannot be mistaken, I am at a loss to render them in tolerable English, and must therefore transfer the translation to the reader.

SECTION FIFTH.

اَصْوَات

THE imitative words of the Persian language are known to Grammarians by the term **اَصْوَات** the plural of **صَوْت** *A sound*: as **چَبْ چَبْ** " The chirruping of birds ;" **کُو کُو** " The cooing of doves ;" **کُخ کُخ** " Laughter ;" **چَک چَک** " The crackling of a candle when the wick has been wet ;" &c. &c. The second member of such words is often connected with the first by the intervention of the letter *Alif* ; as **چَکَا چَکَا** " The noise of the successive strokes of a sword, mace, cudgel, dagger ;" &c. **فَشَا فَشَا** " The whizzing of spears ;" **تَرَنجَا تَرَنجَا** " The twanging of a bow ;" &c. Example : **چَکَا چَکَا بَکَر دَوَن رَسِيد**.

THERE

THERE is nothing to be observed on the application of these words to the purposes of speech, and I shall merely remark that all those terms which are addressed by man to the inferior animals, as *مَج*, *مَج*, &c. have been assigned to this class.

SECTION SIXTH.

اِتِّبَاع

THE word *اِتِّبَاع* signifies *To follow*; and is technically applied to all those unmeaning words which add nothing to the sense of the word which precedes them. Of these words there seems to be a few in every language, as *hurly burly* in English; *تَرْت وِمْرت* or *تَار وِمار* *In confusion*; and *كُت وِمت* *Exactly*; in Persian, &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding chapters contain all the observations I have been able to offer on the nature of nouns abstractedly considered; that is to say, considered without reference to the character which they may happen to assume in the structure of a sentence. But every noun may assume various characters, distinguished in Grammar by various terms; such as *مُبْتَدَا* و *خَبَر* و *فَاعِل* و *مَقْعُول* و *مُضَاف* و *مُضَاف إِلَيْهِ* &c. &c. and it remains, therefore, to consider in their order each of those characters which they are found to assume. Among these, the subject and predicate claim the pre-eminence in point of importance; and will together form the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

مُبْتَدَا وَخَبَر

It has already been stated that every nominal sentence must consist of three terms; *namely*, the *مُبْتَدَا* or SUBJECT OF THE PROPOSITION; the *خَبَر* or PREDICATE OF THE PROPOSITION; and

the رَابِط or MARK OF CONNEXION; as زَيْدٌ نَوْبٌ مُتَدَه است "ZYDE is a writer," &c. The connexion between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition is known by the terms نِسْبَتِ خَبَرِيَّة or نِسْبَتِ تَحْمِيْمَةٍ; and an affirmative relation is distinguished by the term نِسْبَتِ اِثْبَابِي, as opposed to نِسْبَتِ سَلْبِي. A negative relation. The accuracy of a given proposition depends on the existence of what has been called an اِتِّحَادِ ذَاتِي وَتَفَاوُضِ اِعْتِبَارِي between the extreme terms of which it is composed. For if it be affirmed that "This man is virtuous," or "That man is vicious," it is obvious that the sense of the attributes are here conceived to be in union with the sense of the substantive nouns. In the existence of this union consists the اِتِّحَادِ ذَاتِي, a condition, of which the absence will obviously destroy the accuracy of any proposition, since we cannot affirm that "mind possesses the attributes of matter," (such as extension, &c.) merely because the اِتِّحَادِ ذَاتِي cannot, in this case, have any place. The تَفَاوُضِ اِعْتِبَارِي consists in the possible separation, by the mind, of the sense of the terms composing the subject and the predicate of a given proposition: as "The man is or is not good," "The woman is or is not virtuous," &c. and as the absence of this condition necessarily implies that the subject and the predicate are exactly synonymous; as "Thought is thought:" "Will is will:" &c. so it must be obvious, that no information can result from any proposition in which the تَفَاوُضِ اِعْتِبَارِي has no place.

THE foundation of every proposition has been said by Logicians to rest on what is termed the عَقْدُ الْوَضْعِ on the one hand; that is to say, the existence in the subject of the proposition of a given sense which it was formed to denote; and the عَقْدُ اَلْمَثَلِ on the other hand; that is to say, the ascription of the sense of the predicate to that of the subject of a given proposition.

proposition. It follows, therefore, that the subject precedes the predicate in the order of the understanding; because something must be first conceived to exist, before any thing can be affirmed of it. It also follows that the subject must be defined or definite; that is to say, that it must be known; because we can affirm nothing of that which is not defined or known. Supposing therefore that I have occasion to speak of a given fruit; it is obvious that the general term *fruit* must be so restricted as to be applicable to *that particular species of the object* which is then present to my mind; and this is commonly performed in the English language by having recourse to the demonstrative nouns, and to other means: as “ *This fruit* is pleasant to the taste, but “ *that fruit* is very sour;” &c. Or if the subject of a given proposition shall even be accompanied by an indefinite article, it must yet be definite according to the present acceptation of the term; for if it be affirmed that “ *A man* (that is to say that *any man*) may practise virtue;” it is clear that the ability to practise virtue is here ascribed to *every man*; that is to say, to *all men*; or, in other words, to the species itself; from which it follows that the word *man* is here used in a definite sense.

THE rules for the application of articles, and of other definitives, are essentially different in various tongues; but those which are applicable to the Persian language have already been detailed in the chapter which treats of generic nouns, and need not be repeated in this place. I proceed therefore to remark (what indeed must be true of every language, *namely*,) that as the subject takes precedence of the predicate in the order of the understanding, so it must take precedence in the order of speech, whenever the opposite order shall be found to be injurious to the sense of the sentence. Some of the following rules serve merely to illustrate a few of those cases, in which the application of this plain principle determines the necessary precedence of the subject.

RULE

R U L E F I R S T.

SUPPOSING both nouns to be equally capable of becoming the subject or the predicate of a given proposition, the subject will take the precedence whenever the relation between them shall be that of *conversion*. Example : *آری به یمن لطف شما خاک زر شود* " Under the auspices of your favor, earth may indeed *be converted* into gold ; " *از خدمت درویش توانگر شود* " By serving you the poor man will become rich ; " *و از محبت نادان دانا گردد* " And " from your society the ignorant will acquire knowledge." But if the context shall be sufficient to determine the subject, it may in this case follow the predicate ; though such examples are chiefly to be found among the Poets, and seldom or never occur in prose. Example : *از کیمیا بی مهر تو زر گشت روی من* " The alchy- " my of your love has converted my face into gold."

R U L E S E C O N D.

If the subject and the predicate shall be the same word, governing opposite substantive nouns or pronouns in the genitive case, or by means of propositions ; the subject, in this case, must take the precedence. Example : *سلام من سلام توست* " My slave " is your slave ; " &c. &c. But even in this case, the emphatic pronunciation of the word *توست* will enable us to give the precedence to the predicate : as *و سلام توست غلام من* &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

If both nouns shall be equally capable of being the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, and if no injury to the sense of the sentence shall be the consequence of their mutual transposition ; that noun will be generally considered as the predicate which may happen to be last in the order of speech. Example : *برادر تو زیداست* " ZYDE is your brother ; " *زید برادر توست* " Your

“ Your brother is ZYDE ;” &c. &c. But the nature of the objects connected together may often enable us to determine the predicate. Example: *کَرَوَمِ اَست فَسَّان* “ Such a man “ is a scorpion ;” that is to say, “ He is *like* a scorpion ;” &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

It follows from the nature of the subject and the predicate that the former will be generally a substantive, (denoting the name of an event or the name of a substance) and that the latter will be generally an adjective noun. If the predicate shall yet be a substantive noun, an event which is of common occurrence in every language, the two conditions already stated to be necessary to the accuracy of every proposition (namely the *اِتِّحَادِ وَائِنِ وَتَفَیْرِ اِعْتِبَارِ*) must be always expressed or collected from the sense. Example: *زَینِ زَبیدِ مادرِ بکرِ اَست* “ The “ wife of ZYDE is the mother of BUKR ;” &c. There is nothing understood in this example, because it is clear that the same individual who is the wife of one man, may or may not be the mother of another ; from which it follows, that the conditions alluded to are here present in the terms of the proposition. And if these conditions shall not be present in the terms of the proposition, they must be supplied by the understanding of the hearer ; as *وُخَانِهْ مَن دُو کَرَوَهْ اَست* that is to say, *دُو درِی خَانِهْ مَن دُو کَرَوَهْ اَست* “ My house is “ two cofs (or four miles) off ;” *زَیدِ خَسْر اَست* that is to say, *زَیدِ چُون خَسْر اَست* “ ZYDE is an afs ;” or “ ZYDE “ resembles an afs for his stupidity ;” &c. By a figure of speech, the same word may be at once the subject and the predicate of a given proposition ; as *تُو یِ آنگِه تَا مَن مَم بَا مَنِی* “ Thou art with me while I continue to exist ;” &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

WHEN various adjectives are ascribed in the form of so

Q q

many

many predicates to the same object or substantive noun, they must be generally united by the means of a conjunction to be repeated as often as occasion requires. Example:

“جوانی چشت و لطیف و خندان و شیرین زبان بود” There was a “youth smart, witty, cheerful, and eloquent,” &c. Or, in the absence of a copulative conjunction, the *نونه*

must be commonly inserted; and the following adjectives will then be considered as attributes applicable to the *first adjective*, which is alone the true and proper predicate of the proposition.

Example: “خداي ما کریم رحیم دست بگشاید و بزرگوار است” Our God is “bountiful and merciful, the giver of succour and the acceptor of the excuses, which are offered up to him” In poetry, and also in conversation; both connecting particles may be accurately omitted; either for the sake of brevity, or for preserving accuracy in the measure of the verse. Example:

“مرا بار بخت سنگین دل بستم گزشت پیمانی” &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

A PERFECT sentence may be accurately employed as the subject or the predicate of a given proposition. Example: “الله اکبر گفتار من است” or by reversing this order, “My saying is, God is the most high,” &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

WHEN the predicate of the proposition shall be a perfect sentence, it will generally comprise a pronoun applicable to the subject; and the occurrence of this pronoun forms the only bond of union which is necessary to establish their connexion together. Examples: “یکی از آنکه بر من دشمنی نمود” One of those who were guilty of treachery, he was on terms of “friendship with me;” “درویش هر جا که شب آمد سرای اوست” A “poor man; wherever the night overtakes him, there his habitation is.”

REMARKS.

R E M A R K S.

THESE examples exhibit a form of construction which has been deemed inadmissible according to the rules of English Grammar; though many examples of its occurrence may, I believe, be easily discovered by those who will take the trouble to consult the letters and writings of SWIFT, POPE, and even ADDISON himself. Its adoption generally affords a pause in the sentence which is very favorable to the perspicuity of the sense; as in the following example from SHAKESPEAR'S HAMLET :

“ And enterprizes of great pith and moment;

“ With this regard *their* currents turn awry,

“ And lose the name of action.”

It seems to me that SHAKESPEAR here means to assert that “ the currents of enterprizes of great pith and moment turn awry ;” and if so, he has done this with much greater perspicuity, by adopting the form of construction for which I contend, than he could have done by means of any other form of construction whatever. The little word *their* refers to the whole subject of the proposition, and is much more manageable in its actual position, that is to say, in its connexion with the word *currents*, than the subject would be in the same situation.

BUT if it should be contended that the word *currents* forms the accusative and not the nominative case, “ And enterprizes, &c. turn awry their currents,” I am compelled to admit the fact may be so: nay, many people may be of opinion that this last is the only form of construction which the text will bear. In that case, either of the following examples from the same author will sufficiently prove the object which I have in view: namely, that SHAKESPEAR thought the connexion between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition sufficiently established by the occurrence, in the predicate, of a pronoun applicable to the subject of the proposition.

“ But

" But *virtue*, as it never will be moved,
 " Though lewdness court it in a shape of heaven ;
 " So lust, though to a radiant angel linked,
 " Will sate itself in a celestial bed,
 " And prey on garbage."

" Are not these woods
 " More free from peril than the envious court ?
 " Here feel we but the penalty of ADAM,
 " The seasons difference ; as the icy fang,
 " And churlish chiding of the winter's wind ;
 " *Which*, when it bites and blows upon my body,
 " Even 'till I shrink with cold, I smile and say,
 " This is no flattery : these are counsellors,
 " That feelingly persuade me what I am."

I BELIEVE there is no Englishman who will be disposed to admit, unless the fact can be clearly established, that the poetry of these fine passages has been disfigured by the author's inattention to the rules of grammar : yet the word *virtue*, in the first example, is connected with the following verb, not *directly*, but merely by the intervention of the pronoun *it*. Without reference to the poetry, I shall venture to affirm, that the expulsion of that pronoun would destroy entirely the force of the antithesis : " But as virtue never will be moved," &c. and I leave it to those grammarians who have condemned the form of construction to which I have adverted, to shew how the expression of the sentiment, as it stands in the text of its great author, can be improved.

BUT the accuracy of this form of construction has no dependence on any antithesis ; for we find the word *which* in the second example " which when it bites and blows upon my body," indirectly connected with its only verb, namely the word *bites*, in the very same way. And here again, I may bid defiance to any grammarian to change one word in the sentence, without detracting

ing

ing from the perspicuity, as well as the poetry of the passage. What indeed can be more reasonable than it is to state, in the first place, the subject to which we have occasion to call the attention of the hearer; "The person of whom I had occasion to speak to you the other day," and subsequently to get rid of this long sentence by means of a simple pronoun? "*his* father, who is my intimate friend, is desirous to introduce him to your notice."

Now if this form of construction shall be admitted to rest on reasonable principles, (a proposition I think which cannot be denied) it will yet be inadmissible in the English language wherever the use of it has not been sanctioned by the authority of those writers who have attained the rank of classical eminence; but why the examples of its occurrence should be selected from the works of our best authors, for the purpose of proscribing the principle on which it rests, is a question which is very far beyond the reach of my understanding.

It may be admitted that the use of it in the following example from ATTERBURY'S Sermons, (see LOWTH'S Grammar, pag. 131) is not very happy: "Which rule if *it* had been observed, a neighbouring prince would have wanted a great deal of that incense which had been offered up to him by his adorers;" and the alteration proposed by Doctor LOWTH, *If this rule had been observed*, may perhaps be regarded as an improvement of the passage. But when Doctor LOWTH proceeds to condemn the principle on which it is founded, by remarking that "The pronoun "*it*" is here the nominative case to the verb *observed*;" and that, "*which rule* is left by itself a nominative case without any verb following it," and that "this manner of expression however improper is very common;" I am tempted to ask whether the censure of Doctor LOWTH does not extend to the most commonly received expressions in the English language: as when we affirm that *it began to rain*; &c. For if it were asked what began? it must be certainly answered that the event began which is signified

R r

Ly

by the verb *to rain*; and to this event and no other we must of necessity refer the pronoun *it*. *It began to rain: To rain, it or that began: &c.* So, also, in the celebrated soliloquy of HAMLET: "To be or not to be, *that* is the question:" where the expulsion of the pronoun *that* would disfigure the sentence beyond the sufferance of human patience.

IF I were disposed to justify the expression of ATTERBURY which has been condemned by Doctor LOWTH, I might accurately reason in the following manner: How can that be improper in Language which is at once perfectly intelligible, and admitted to be of common use among the best authors? Let it be granted that *which* rule is in the nominative case, and that it is not *directly* followed by any verb; and the fair inference from these premises will be, not that ATTERBURY has committed a violation of the rules of English Grammar, but that the nominative case does not in our language require to be *directly* connected with the verb. It is *indirectly* connected with it (by the intervention of the pronoun *it*) in the very example which is the subject of discussion; and this, being the admitted practise of many good authors, constitutes all that is necessary to establish the accuracy of an English proposition. For it may be affirmed as an unerring truth that every thing is good English, which is at once perfectly intelligible and of common use among the best authors; and there can be no reason of necessity why every nominative must be *directly* connected with its verb, if a given proposition can be rendered intelligible by means of a nominative which is not directly but *indirectly* connected with it. The proposition in question is perfectly intelligible, and the alteration proposed by Dr. LOWTH, adds nothing to the perspicuity of the sense. Why then should we adopt that alteration? or why banish from our language a form of construction so favorable to perspicuity as that which is here proscribed by him? The grammarian undertakes too much who proposes to *improve* the language of which he treats. It was the business of Dr. LOWTH to illustrate the rules applicable to the *existing* language of

of the English nation as he found it recorded in their best authors ; not to set up the authority of his own precepts against his true and legitimate masters converting, by this means, the majority of his examples into a severe satire against his own rules, by which they are condemned.

THERE are cases, indeed, in which a grammarian may call in question the language of any human authority ; but if the object of his hostility shall be a great master speaking the language of his native country, the grammarian ought to be very certain that his strictures are founded in truth. But his strictures cannot be so founded, if the disputed expression shall be at once perfectly intelligible and of common use among the best authors ; because there is nothing else but this necessary to establish, in any language, the propriety and accuracy of a given proposition. Dr. LOWTH admits that the manner of expression which he has condemned is of common occurrence in the English language ; and as the perspicuity of the phrase will not be questioned by any reader, it follows that the manner of expression should not be *generally* condemned by him. Of the particular accuracy of its application, in the instance quoted from ATTERBURY's sermons, I have already expressed some hesitating doubts ; and they are founded in my belief that ATTERBURY has there deviated from the common usage of the English tongue, by the unusual application to a given proposition, of a form of construction which, though perfectly accurate in many cases, has yet been condemned by custom in many others.

* * * * *

THE form of construction to which I have adverted is of constant occurrence in the Persian Language, of which it may be remarked as a general truth, that any sentence which contains a pronoun applicable to the subject, may be accurately employed as the predicate of a given proposition ; whatever may be the nature of the relation existing between them.

EXAMPLE.

EXAMPLE.

خواجہ درویش مشرب و ز جوانی بہ پسنبری ملقب گمان قفسہ آنتست کہ
مقصود وی از مہاجریت اوطان و مفارقت اخوان زبانت و رویشان است
و تقرب بملأ زمیت ایشان نہ تحصیل آمال و امانی و حصول ترخربت فانی

" THE pious Khaja who has acquired in his youth the excellencies of age; my opinion is, that in leaving *his* home and quitting the society of *his* friends, *he* has been influenced by a desire to visit holy men, and to obtain admission into their society; not by a wish to indulge in the trifling pleasures and transitory gratifications of this life."

IN this example, the words خواجہ درویش مشرب و ز جوانی بہ پسنبری ملقب form the subject of the proposition, to which all that follows must be considered as the predicate. The connexion between them is sufficiently established by the occurrence in the predicate of the pronoun وی. The example is taken from the letters of JAUMEE, in which many others of the same nature might be easily found.

RULE EIGHTH.

THE subject and the predicate of a given proposition must be united by the means of a رابط or *mark of connexion*; and the رابط will generally follow the predicate of the proposition, or the last predicate if there shall be more than one. Examples:
و لبرم سبیرین زبان "Zyne is intelligent;"
و بگانه زمان است "My mistress is eloquent and peerless in the age;" &c.

RULE NINTH.

IN poetry or in measured prose the رابط may yet be inserted any where, according to the option of every writer;
with

with this only exception, that است must be used for است as the first member of an affirmative sentence. Examples: *بشکم بست بدست است و زنجیر پای* "The belly binds up the hands and the feet;" *خدا است رزاق و رزوی ران* "God is the universal provider;" *وون است و ناپاس و بی‌فله و حق ناشناس* "He is mean, ungrateful, and ignorant of his duties;" *خداوند یگانه که تدبیر این کارخانه و مقلب اوضاع زمانه است* "The only true God who is the ruler of the world, and the source of all the events that happen therein;" &c. Though the words *زید نویسنده* or *زید نویسنده است* might be accurately employed to signify "ZYDE is or is not a writer;" the word است must always follow some other word, and will never occur at the beginning of a sentence.

R U L E T E N T H.

In a negative sentence the letter *نون نقی* is generally prefixed to the *رابط* as *توانگر نیستم* "I am not rich;" but there are several exceptions to this rule, some of which are detailed in that which follows.

R U L E E L E V E N T H.

If the same predicate shall be applicable to each of two or more subjects, the letter *نون نقی* will be often prefixed to each of those nouns that form the subjects. Example: *نه زید نیکیست است نه عسمر* "Neither is ZYDZ good nor is AMA." Or if the case shall be reversed; that is to say, if there shall be more than one predicate to the same subject; the letter *نون نقی* will be often repeated in the same way. Example: *نه زید عاقل است نه فاضل* "ZYDZ is neither learned nor wise." Or if the negation shall be intended to destroy a necessary connexion that might be otherwise supposed to exist between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition,

S s

fition,

sition, the negative particle will be generally the first word in the sentence. Example: *نه هر که مصورت نیکو است سیرت زیبا و راوست* " Every handsome man is not therefore possessed of a good disposition ;" &c. &c.

R U L E T W E L F T H.

Of the three terms composing the members of a given proposition, any one (or more) may be accurately omitted whenever its absence can be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader. Examples: *چیست و شب از خدا غافل بدن* " In what consist the evils of the world ?" In our indifference to God the creator of " the world." The word *شب* *The world*, is here the subj ct of enquiry ; and being stated in the question, it is therefore omitted in the answer which is here given by the interrogator himself. *به شیری شب دست بردن به تیغ بدنان گزند و دست در تیغ* " To give way to anger (is evil ; and he who does so) will have " occasion to gnaw the hand of regret." The words between parentheses are omitted in Persian ; and their place is supplied by the following sentence describing the consequences that flow from the indulgence of angry passions. Such omissions, though very common in the Persian Language, are generally inadmissible in our Tongue.

R U L E T H I R T E E N T H.

THE omission of the connective will be deemed elegant in verse or in measured prose, whenever the subject, being followed a relative clause, shall be united with a predicate which is an *استم تفضیل*. Example: *بدان در هر که بالا تر فرد تر* " Those " who are highest in rank (or in their own conceit) are lowest in " the estimation of God." Or if the predicate shall be a simple adjective noun, the connective will yet be often omitted for the sake of the sound. Example: *نه هر که در مجادله دست در مشت نامه در دست* " Every wrangler is not therefore a good man of business."

RULE

RULE FOURTEENTH.

THE connective will be often omitted when two propositions shall be directly opposed to each other, as
 “ ما چو ذره هست و آن خورشید بس عالی مقام ” We are mean as
 “ atoms, and that luminary is of infinite dignity ;” or in a negative
 sentence, as “ تو بکس و کس بتو مانند نی ” Neither dost THOU re-
 “ semble any other being, nor does any other being resemble THEE.”
 Or if the subject, being an infinitive, shall be connected with a pre-
 dicate which is by sense or otherwise an *اسم تفضیل*. Example
 “ بدست آهک نغته کردن خمیر به از دست بر بستن پیش امیر ” To
 “ prepare a flaked lime with the hands, (or, in other words, To
 “ practise manual labour) is better than submitting to the humi-
 “ lity of servitude.” Or if the predicate shall be a verb in the preter-
 perfect tense: as “ خوشتر ز چشم منست جهان ندیده ” Nothing
 “ was ever seen more beautiful than your animated eyes ;” &c.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

THE three terms of a given proposition are susceptible, in the Persian language, of the variations of number. If the subject shall be of the plural number and of the rational species, the *رابط* will assume the plural number ; but the predicate will most commonly retain the singular, though many examples of the contrary might be adduced. Examples : *ایشان توانگر اند* or *ایشان توانگر اند* “ They are rich ;” *ما بیچاره ایم* or *ما بیچاره گانیم* “ We are unfortu-
 “ nate ;” &c. The assumption by the predicate of the plural number, seems to have been anciently very common ; but, in modern times, the singular number is generally retained ; and the *رابط* alone assumes the plural. That the *رابط* sometimes (though rarely) retains the singular, the following example will sufficiently evince : *خوبان اصفهان چو شقایق پسند نیست* “ Since
 “ O SHIVAE you like not the damsels of Isfahaun ;” &c.

RULE

R U L E S I X T E E N T H.

If the subject, being in the plural number, shall be the name of an animal not rational, the رَابِط will generally assume the plural, and the predicate will commonly retain the singular number. Example: شِیرَانِ بَیْتِ گَاهِ سَگِ اَشْتَاہِ اَنْدَ "The tygers of the wilderness are as dogs before the threshold of his door." Of the retention by the رَابِط of the singular number, some examples might be easily adduced: (as شِیرَانِ بُوْدَ مَرَّ جَمَلِہِ نَجَبَ "I had a number of camels of an excellent breed,") yet I am persuaded that the رَابِط in this case will be generally found to be in the plural number.

R U L E S E V E N T E E N T H.

If the subject, being the name of an inanimate object, shall assume the Persian form of the plural in اِن, the رَابِط will often assume the plural and the predicate will preserve the singular number. Examples: دَرَخْتَانِ سَہْزَادِہِ شَدْدَ "The trees are become green;" چَرَاغِہَا نِ رُو شَنِ شَدْدَ "The lamps have been lighted;" &c. But in this case the singular number may be accurately retained: as دَرَخْتَانِ رُو شَنِ شَدْدَ and in the case of an Arabic plural of the imperfect class, or of a Persian plural formed in ت, the singular number will be most commonly retained, if the subject shall be the name of an inanimate object. Examples: مُوَجِبِ الْعَقِيْنِ يَبُوْدُ بَرَاہِيْنِ وَتَحْجِجُ "Proofs and arguments (drawn from reason) are not the best means to ascertain the truth;" * مِيَا نِ اَوْدُوْستِ دَرِيَا نَا حَايِلِ شَدْدَ "Seas

* It is the creed of the SOOFIS, that there are two modes of acquiring knowledge; the one by the exercise of reason and reflexion; the other by the means of fasting and prayer. The knowledge acquired by the exercise of reason is termed by them عِلْمُ الْعَقِيْنِ op-
posed

" Seas intervene between me and my beloved ;" &c. Those Arabic plurals which denote the names of inanimate objects generally follow the same rules with the Persian plurals of that class.

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

WHEN various nouns are connected together by means of copulative conjunctions, they will generally require the verb to be in the plural number; if they shall denote the names of living creatures.

Examples :

posed to the other species of knowledge, which is indifferently termed **عَيْنُ الْيَقِينِ** or **حَقُّ الْيَقِينِ**; though many have established a distinction between the two last terms. To explain by examples. We infer the presence of fire when we have seen the smoke; and this is an instance of the **عَيْنُ الْيَقِينِ**; but if we see the fire, or if we fall into it, we are absolutely certain of the presence of fire; and this more perfect species of knowledge is termed by the Soorss **حَقُّ الْيَقِينِ** or **عَيْنُ الْيَقِينِ**; the last term denoting a species of knowledge still more infallible than that which precedes it. The mind of a true Soorss, purified from the mists of the flesh by the continual contemplation of the Divine perfections, becomes, as it were, an unfulfilled mirror; in which is reflected, by the light of immediate inspiration, the very omniscience of the DEITY himself. His soul is not, like his body, restricted to any local habitation; since we hear of Soorss, who have carried on spiritual conversations together, though their persons were separated by the intervention of many thousand miles. In fact, it is difficult to set any bounds to the miraculous powers of a perfect Soorss; because the limitation of his power is understood to imply that he has not yet attained all the perfection of which his nature is susceptible even in this world. With the exception of his final absorption in the essence of the DEITY, in which consists the completion of his beatitude, I am not aware indeed, that there is any limit to the perfections attainable by him in this world. As iron when put into the fire, acquires all the properties of light and heat by which we can distinguish that element; so a Soorss, absorbed in the continual contemplation of the DEITY, is supposed to be gradually (but in the end wholly) assimilated to HIM. I remember a story related in some Oriental books, which, though absurd in itself, may throw some light on the ideas entertained of the knowledge of the Soorss. The celebrated ABOO ALEE SYNA (AVICENNA) is considered as the greatest philosopher, as well as physician, that ever existed among the Oriental nations. Like a true philosopher, he did not pretend to the possession of any knowledge but such as he was able to acquire by study and reflexion. He was a contemporary of the not less celebrated ABOO KHALE, a Soorss of the very first order, who trusted for the acquisition of knowledge, to fasting and prayer. A conversation took place between these two eminent persons, in which each had reason to admire the profundity of the other in matters of science. At the conclusion of the conversation the philosopher addressed the Soorss in these terms :

أَتَجِدُ تَوْحِيدِي بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ مَبْدَأِمْ "What you see I know;" that is to say, "I know it by the exercise of reason and reflection;" to which the Soorss replied;

أَتَجِدُ تَوْحِيدِي دَانِي مِنْ جِي بَشَيْم "What

T t

Examples: زبید و عمر فرسند شدند " ZYDE and AMR were pleased;"
 است و گاؤ فرسند شدند " The horse and the cow have become
 " fat;" &c. If the nouns shall not be the names of animals, the
 singular number will be generally retained: but the use of the
 plural will be often optional to every speaker. Example:
 نازده شدند or باز در باغ لاله و شبلی نازده شد
 " the hyacinth have once more sprung up in the garden."

RULE NINETEENTH.

If the sense of a given substantive noun, denoting the name
 of a living creature, shall be multiplied by means of an *اسم عدد*
 the verb will generally assume the plural, but the singular num-
 ber may yet be retained. Example: ترا هزار اسیر اند or
 ترا هزار اسیر است " You have a thousand lovers;" &c. If
 the substantive noun shall not be the name of a living creature,
 the singular number will be generally retained. Example:
 دو کار است بفر و فرخندگی " There are two things extremely
 " proper in their own nature."

RULE TWENTIETH.

If the nominative shall be a collective noun, or if it shall follow

"What you know I see," that is to say, "I see it by the light of divine inspiration." The Sooraa however had the advantage of the philosopher; for it is said, that having occasion to build a house, he issued a successful order to one of the beams that happened to be too short for his purpose, to extend its length by two or three feet. It may be conjectured that the philosopher did not possess, among the stores of his knowledge, any secret which would have enabled him to perform this singular feat.

The verse in the text, which has given occasion to this note, will now be better understood. It is as follows:

پیشم جان را ده جسا بکند رزگفت و گزنی عقل
 موجب مبین البیقین نبو دبر اهریمن و حج

"Brighten the eyes of your soul (by the contemplation of the divine perfections,) and do not
 " puzzle yourself with the exercise of reason; for proofs and arguments drawn from reason
 " will never lead you to the مبین البیقین."

the

the words *همه*, *همان*, &c. the verb may be put into either number; but the singular number will be most commonly retained in the case of a nominative denoting the name of an inanimate object. Examples: *جمع شدند* or *تشکر جمع شد* "The army has been assembled;" *همه آدمی مضطرب گشت* or *مضطرب گشتند* "Every man was, or all men were alarmed;" *همه تن بد حال گردیدند* or *بد حال گردیدند* "All men were, or every man was reduced to distress;" &c. In the proper acceptation of the terms, there is a difference between the words *همه* and *همان*; the one corresponding in point of sense with the word *all*, and the other with the word *every*; but notwithstanding that, both these words admit of being occasionally followed by a verb in either number, because each will be found to assume occasionally the sense of the other. The plural number will yet be generally preserved after *همه*, and the singular number after *همان*.

CONCLUSION.

It follows from the preceding rules, that the concord of number between the verb and its nominative is very little regarded in the Persian language; since there is not, perhaps, a single rule to which many exceptions might not be adduced. These rules (such as they are) are equally applicable to a sentence consisting of *two* or of *three* terms: that is to say, they are applicable to any sentence whether it shall consist of a *subject*, a *predicate*, and a *mark of connexion*; or merely of a *nominative* followed by its *verb*. Of the nominative followed by its verb, I am now about to treat; and shall therefore have occasion to resume the subject of the concord between them, and to place it, perhaps, in a clearer light than that in which it has been placed in this chapter. I have remarked on a former occasion that the vowel *که* and the letter *نون*, when joined to the predicate of a given proposition, possessed anciently the sense of the substantive

to the application of a verbal sentence ; because this is the only point by which it can be determined whether the subject of a given proposition must be definite or otherwise in either case.

Now the nominal and the verbal sentence are very generally convertible together ; for we say, with equal accuracy, " JOHN writeth ;" or " JOHN is writing ;" " JAMES readeth ;" or " JAMES is reading ;" &c. Yet it does not seem to accord with reason, or with the general usage of language in other respects, that there should never be any distinction between them ; because, in that case, it is most probable that many nations, satisfied with the invention of one, (which must have answered every purpose of both) would have saved themselves the trouble of inventing the other. In what, then, consists the general principle which regulates in language the application of a nominal as contradistinguished from a verbal sentence ?

I HAVE already admitted that both are very generally convertible together, and so far there cannot be any distinction between them. But if any one or more languages shall be examined with the necessary attention, it may be found, perhaps, that the following principle operates with considerable influence on them all. Whenever the subject of a given proposition shall happen to be the chief and primary object of our thoughts, a nominal sentence will be generally employed ; and, on the contrary, if our attention shall be more strongly arrested by the predicate, than it is by the subject of a given proposition, we shall generally employ a verbal sentence. If it be affirmed, for example, that " Such a man walked a certain distance within a given time," the attention of the hearer will be most powerfully directed to the action of the verb ; and if it be affirmed, on the other hand, that " Such a man is the person who walked (or was the walker) of a certain distance within a given time," the primary attention of the hearer will then be directed to the subject of the proposition. Again ; it may be accurately affirmed that " a man

" (we

“ (we know not what man) walked from London to York
 “ within a given time,” but we must know and define the man,
 before we can affirm the same fact by having recourse to the aid
 of a nominal sentence. We might certainly say that “ a man
 “ who is known to you and me was the person who performed
 “ this pedestrian exploit;” but it would be nonsense (except as
man is opposed to *woman* or to other animals) to say that “ a man
 “ (we know not what man) was the person who performed it.”

Now I conceive there can be no reason but that which I have
 stated, (namely, that the subject of a nominal sentence is the
 chief and primary object of our attention,) why this fact may not
 be accurately conveyed by having recourse to the aid of a nomi-
 nal sentence; and that it may be conveyed by having recourse to
 the aid of a verbal sentence seems to me to be a convincing proof
 that the attention of the speaker and of the hearer is most power-
 fully directed, in a verbal sentence, to the predicate and not to
 the subject of the proposition. Accordingly the subject or
 agent of a verbal sentence will be often wholly indefinite in every
 language; *first*, when the verb is used in the passive voice, as
 when we say that “ a certain person was robbed,” without stating
 who was the robber; and *secondly*, when the verb is used in the
 active voice, as in the following example: “ The public have ex-
 “ pressed their approbation or disapprobation of such a measure;”
 in which the word *public* has obtained an acceptance so perfect-
 ly indefinite, that every dabbler in politics believes himself at liber-
 ty to dignify with that appellation, a few obscure individuals who
 may happen to coincide in opinion with himself. The truth then
 seems to be, that we often take no pains to define the subject of
 a verbal sentence, because our business, in this case, is not so much
 with the *subject* as it is with the *predicate* of a given proposition;
 and that we take pains to define the subject of a nominal sentence,
 because it is generally the chief and primary object of our
 thoughts.

THE

THERE is no doubt, however, that many examples might be adduced, in which the attention of the hearer will be equally directed to the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; and, in this case, it is probable that the subject must be generally defined by some means or other, and that the proposition may then be accurately conveyed, as well by a nominal as a verbal sentence.

THE preceding observations are merely intended as an attempt (perhaps very unsuccessful) to suggest the probable cause of what I conceive to be a very singular principle of Arabic Grammar, which has never hitherto been well explained. They are, I believe, more accurately applicable to Arabic idiom, than they are to the idiom of the English or of the Persian language; and as I am well aware that they were not necessary in this work, so, the errors into which they may have led me are unreluctantly submitted as a prey to satiate the rapacious appetite of critical severity. I now return to the more immediate subject of this chapter.

• In considering the application of the **فَاعِل** to the purposes of speech, there are three things which naturally demand the attention of the learner: *first*, the rules which determine the position of the **فَاعِل** in the structure of a sentence; *secondly*, the rules which determine its occasional omission; and, *finally*, the rules which determine its concord with a given verb. Each of these points are discussed in the following rules.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE **فَاعِل** should be the first word in every sentence; and, in case of the occurrence of a sentence in which either of two substantive nouns might be the **فَاعِل**, the first of these nouns, will assume that character by the influence of its position in the structure of the sentence. Examples: **مَرْدِي بَشِيرِي گشت** " A
" man

“ man killed a tyger ; ” بشری مردی کشت “ A tyger killed a man ; ” &c. It is to be observed, however, that the termination *ر* will be almost invariably inserted after the *مفعول* in all examples of this nature : as *بشری مردی را کشت* &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

In poetry, or in any kind of prose, if the absence of this natural order shall not be the occasion of producing obscurity, the *فَاعِل* may yet be inserted any where. Example : *زیرِ خودی طلب یار می کند حافظ* “ URGED by insanity (the insanity of love,) HAFIZ persists in the pursuit of his mistress ; ” *چو مقبلی که طلب کار گنج قارون است* “ Like a beggar who desires to possess the treasures of KAROON.” I shall not encumber the work by the multiplication of examples of this nature ; because the Persian language admits of the utmost latitude of arrangement that can be conceived or desired : as *حافظ طلب یار می کند* و *می کند حافظ طلب یار و طلب یار می کند حافظ* و *حافظ طلب یار می کند* &c. The natural order should, however, be invariably preserved, unless there shall be some good reason for setting it aside.

R U L E T H I R D.

In a sentence which contains a relative pronoun, there will be, of necessity, two verbs ; and the same antecedent may be the nominative to both ; or the accusative to both, or the *ظرف* to both ; or the nominative to the one and the accusative to the other ; or vice versa ; &c. &c. as already detailed in the chapter which treats of relative pronouns. With the nominative alone we have to do at present ; and the rules which are applicable to it in this case, having already been detailed in that chapter,

W w

need

need not be repeated in this place. In the following example from the poet *حالی*, the word *راز*, which is the accusative to the verb comprised in the relative clause, is the nominative to that which occurs in the predicate of the proposition.

راز سرشته که خامان نگفتند بهم از کجا آمد و چون در دین عام افتاد

“ Whence comes the mystery which the learned were unable to solve ; and how has it become known to vulgar minds ! ”

R U L E F O U R T H.

Of the conditional sentence, that is to say, of a sentence comprising a *شَرط* or conditional member, and a *جَزَا* which denotes the consequence flowing from the *شَرط*, I shall have occasion to treat more fully hereafter. In the mean time, it is enough to observe, that it must comprise of necessity two verbs ; and that the same noun may be at once the nominative to both verbs, or the nominative to either and the accusative to the other ; &c. &c. In the following example, the noun *پیه ووز* happens to be the nominative to both verbs, and follows both in the structure of the sentence ; which must be considered, however, as an unusual arrangement more adapted to poetry than it is to prose.

گمبختی روزه از شهر خویش سنجی و تحت زبر و پیه دوز

“ A fever of garments, (a man who has a profession by which he can earn his livelihood) if he goes into exile, will yet experience no hardship.”

R U L E F I F T H.

It is a rule common to every language, that the *فَاعِل* or AGENT may be omitted on certain occasions ; as for example, when we employ the verb in the passive voice, without stating or desiring to state, or perhaps without knowing the name of the person by whose agency the event which we contemplate was carried

carried into effect. Example: *زید کشته شد* "ZYDE was "killed;" &c. It is wholly unnecessary to multiply examples of this nature; but the following is the principle on which the omission of the *فَاعِل*, in all such cases, must necessarily depend. *First*, It may happen that we do not know, or knowing, that we have no desire to communicate the name of the agent of a given verb; and, in this case, the verb will be generally employed in the passive voice as already explained in the preceding example. Or, *secondly*, it may happen that there is something in the sentence which we utter, or in the circumstances under which it is uttered, that will enable the hearer to determine the agent; and, in this case, the verb may be alone employed in the active voice; as *آید*. "He is coming;" in answer to the question *آیا زید آید* "Is ZYDE coming?" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE omission of the *فَاعِل* in certain cases, may yet depend on the particular idiom of a given tongue; and, in the Persian language, it will be accordingly, and perhaps invariably omitted, if the nominative shall be the AGENTS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, to whose ministry is committed the conduct of all sublunary affairs. The examples of its omission in this case are numerous beyond all calculation; but one will be sufficient for every useful purpose.

وَرَنگوییِ نیک نامی ما را گذرند آوند گزشتن نمی پسندی تغییر کن نصرا

"THEY (THE MINISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE) have barred "against me the road that leads to a fair and spotless reputation; "O you, who are offended at my backslidings, change, I pray "you, the decrees of fate."*

RULE

* I have already had occasion to remark that the ZAVHIDS or DEVOTEEs are the continual objects of the poetical enmity of HAFIZ and of all the SOOFIES; and to them it is, that
HAFIZ

RULE SEVENTH.

Or, if the nominative to a given verb shall be *شیر مبین* that is to say, the word *people*, when that word is used without

an

HARIZ has addressed the fancy verses quoted in the text. "You admit," he means to say, "the doctrine of predestination, which is taught in the text of the KOORAUH itself; and does it not follow as a consequence of that Doctrine, that however false, however polluted is the life which I lead, it must be ascribed, not to the voluntary effect of my own free choice, but to the restless influence of the DIVINE WILL, which predetermined every action of my life. If the conduct of my life be such, therefore, as to scandalize the hypocritical sanctity of your professions, ascribe the effect to its true cause; and change, I pray you, the decrees of Providence, which is alike the author of my vices, and of the virtues which you have the presumption to arrogate to yourselves." Were these the sentiments of a MOOMUMUDAN infidel, they would not stand in need of any comment; but though I think there is much reason to suspect the orthodoxy of certain ENTUSIASMS among the Oriental nations, I have never been able to consider the SOORAS in any other light than as a sect of the most ardent fanatics in religion. Their doctrine, however, have, I believe, a strong resemblance to those of SPINOSA; and like his, would probably be found to lead directly to Materialism, or perhaps to Atheism itself, if closely examined by the cool and discriminating judgment of a European reasoner. It is infinitely beyond the powers of my understanding to give a consistent and connected account of the doctrines of the SOORAS; yet such an account is by much the greatest desideratum in Persian literature. They certainly assert their belief in the KOORAUH; yet the principles which they profess have no apparent consistency with the doctrines taught in that book. The DEITY, according to them, seems to be the author of all religions, (as indeed he is the author of every thing else;) from which it certainly follows as a corollary, that one religion is as good as another. As to the precepts taught in the KOORAUH, though perfect in themselves, they are supposed by the SOORAS to have a mystical sense, which lies much deeper than the literal meaning of the word would seem to imply. A ZAVUD may be described as a person who follows the dictates of the KOORAUH according to the obvious and literal acceptation of the words in which these dictates are conveyed; and such a person has been stigmatized among the SOORAS by the term *اهل صورت* *A man who flims the surface of things*. A SOORAN is equally bound to follow the precepts taught in the KOORAUH; but then he is an *اهل مبین*, he has penetrated the mystery to the very bottom; and has manufactured a system of his own, which does not apparently retain a single feature of the work with which it is said to coincide. The entire harmony between them will nevertheless be affirmed by a true SOORAN; and our inability to perceive it, will furnish, in his mind, a proof of the dulness of our intellect, of what he will term our *دل مزیجی* but not of the errors of his own system. It is necessary to add that the SOORAS permit themselves to talk of wine and women with the utmost freedom; (because their conceptions, they say, cannot be otherwise expressed than by the means of metaphor, that is to say, of figures borrowed from the objects of sense;) but not, in my

opinion,

an article; as "People say;" "People think;" &c. &c. the verb will be put into the third person plural, and the nominative will then be wholly omitted. Example: *گویند* *آوردند* "It has been said;" *گویند* "It is said;" *آوردند* "They asked LOOKMAUN, of whom he had learnt propriety of conduct:" &c. In such examples as these, we are most commonly ignorant of the true nominative to a given verb; for the word *people*, when used without an article, conveys no information which is not comprised in the following verb. But though we are not ignorant of the nominative, it may yet be often elegantly omitted when the context shall enable us to supply it with ease; as in the following example in which *مفسرین*, a SOOFEE poet, has attacked, with their own weapons, the public teachers of the law of MOOHUM-MUD.

opinions, to practise debauchery of any kind. I do not mean to say that no SOOFEE has ever committed vice; the assertion would be wholly incredible; but merely to state that they are a sect of fanatics who believe in the truth of their own creed, notwithstanding the intermixture of much absurdity as well as sublimity, in which it abounds. Of the tendency of their creed (if it has any tendency) to the atheistical system of the celebrated SPINOZA, it is very possible that they may not be aware. The doctrine of predestination seems to have confounded all their faculties; and among the Hindoos, who are supposed to have been the first inventors of the SOOFEE system, (the system also of PLATO according to the opinion of Oriental writers) it may have been the result of a desire to reconcile this doctrine of predestination with the received opinions of the goodness of God. God, however, according to the SOOFEE I believe, and certainly according to some Oriental writers, is himself a necessary agent; and the attributes of severity and of mercy, of love, and of wrath, &c. are deemed to be mere human passions, which can have no existence in his mind.

The question that relates to the opposite doctrines of LIBERTY and NECESSITY, is probably of a nature too high to be successfully canvassed by the reasoning powers of any order of created beings.

Others apart sat on a hill retir'd,
In thoughts more elevate; and reason'd high,
Of Providence, fore knowledge, will, and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, fore knowledge absolute;
And found no end in wandering mazes lost.

I believe, however, that a view of the state of society in the Eastern world might furnish many strong arguments against the adoption of the doctrine of NECESSITY as a popular creed among the nations of the earth.

مکتوبند که فردوس برین خواهد بود آنجائی ناب و حور عینین خواهد بود
مگر بای و معشوقی مگر بدیم چه باک چون مایه قبت کار بمین خواهد بود

" PARADISE they tell us (that is, the *اهل شرع* or public teachers of the Law tell us) is a delightful abode; it abounds in pure wine; and there, also, are the large eyed Houras destined to bless us in their happy embraces. If I then have chosen my beloved, and have not abstained from the pleasures of wine, where, I ask, is the harm in doing that now, which at the last is to be done?"

R U L E E I G H T H.

If the nominative or agent to a given verb shall be of the rational species, and of the plural number, the verb must be also put into the plural. Example: *یاران رفتند* "My friends are gone;" *و مرا برج گذاشتند* "And have left me in sorrow;" &c. The exceptions to this rule are of rare occurrence, and are never to be found except in poetry. Example from HAUFIZ: *اَوّای اتم نشین دل که یارانت برفت از یاد* "O thou companion of my heart whose friends are wholly forgotten by thee!" &c.

R U L E N I N T H.

If there shall be two or more nominatives to a given verb, connected together by copulative conjunctions, the verb must be put into the plural number, if the nouns shall be the names of rational beings. Examples: *زید و عمر آمدند* "ZYDE and AMR came;" *بکر و خالید رفتند* "BUKR and KHALID went away;" &c. If the nouns thus connected together, shall be of various persons, the verb will assume the first person before the second; and the second person before the third. Example: *باید که تو و اهل مملکت تو بزرودی بروید* "It is necessary that

“ that you and the people of your kingdom should quickly go,” &c. There are few exceptions to this rule ; that is to say, there are few of the cases stated in it, in which the verb will not assume the plural number ; and these are chiefly or entirely to be found among the poets.

EXAMPLE.

مُتَمَسِّمِ دَارِ پَرِ جَاكِ شَدِ اَن مَرُورَا تَقَمَّ جَانَا شِئِ دَوَرِوِشِ وَگَدَا پِشِشِ اَدِ
نَمَال

RULE TENTH.

If the agent, being the name of a rational being, shall be multiplied by the aid of a noun of number, the verb will be generally put into the plural number. Example : “ ده مَرُورِ تَوَانِ کِمَانِ اَوَرَا زِهَ کَرِ دَنَدِی ” Ten strong men could not have bent his bow.” The exceptions to this rule are pretty numerous, and more especially in the case of the substantive verb ; but the nominative, in this case, will be the مُبْتَدَا not the فاعِل, because the proposition will consist of three terms. The verb هَسْت has, however, a double sense ; and if it be used as a perfect verb in the following example, the nominative will then be the فاعِل or agent.

دَرِ غُفْنِهٖ اِهَنُوزِ وَصَدَتْ عَشْدَلِیْبِ اَسْت

“ You are still in the blossom and already you have, (or there exist for you,) a hundred lovers.”

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the agent shall be a collective noun denoting a collection or multitude of rational beings, the verb will generally retain the singular ; but the plural number may yet be assumed according to the option of every speaker. Example : عُلُقِی مِی گویند or “ عُلُقِی مِی گویند ” The multitude say ;” &c.

RULE

RULE TWELFTH.

If the agent shall be the name of a rational being following the word **همه**, *all*, or any of its synonymes, it will itself most commonly retain the singular number, but the verb will generally assume the plural. Example: **همه کس آمدند** "All the people came;" &c. But the word **همه** is sometimes, though rarely, used in the sense of **هر** *every*; and, in this case, the verb will retain the singular number.

EXAMPLE.

همه کس روزی بهی می شکایت ازین ایام مشکل این است که هر روز برتری بستم
 مانت

"EVERY man complains of his unfortunate condition in
 " this age of human misery, yet each day brings with it some
 " new evil to be added to those of the preceding day."

RULE THIRTEENTH.

If the agent shall be the name of a rational being following the word **هر** *every*, or any of its synonymes, the verb will generally retain the singular number. Example: **هر که شکر زند شکر بخشد**
 "Return good for evil;" literally, "Give sugar to him who
 " pelts you with stones." But the word **هر** or **هریک** is sometimes, though rarely, used in the sense of **همه** *all*, and in this case the verb will assume the plural number.

EXAMPLE.

هریک از دایره جمیع برای رفتند ما بماندیم و خیال تو بیک جای متقیم
 مادی

"ALL have quitted the circle of the assembly; and I alone,
 " accompanied by the idea of you which never leaves me, remain
 " immoveable in perplexity and grief."

RULE

RULE FOURTEENTH.

If the agent shall be the name of a rational being, connected with other nouns by the intervention of the particle *with*, or by the intervention of any similar particle, the verb will retain the singular number. Example: *زید با عسمر آمد* "Zyde came with Amer;" &c. In modern language the verb, in this case, is frequently found to assume the plural number; but I conceive this form of construction to be insufficiently established by unexceptionable authority; and it is therefore inelegant in all probability.

EXAMPLE.

قاضی بامر دمان از بلاک او خا طبر جمع کرده باز گشتند
رفیع واعظ

"THE judge with his people returned home after having put this man to death."

RULE FIFTEENTH.

THE last seven rules regard the concord, in point of number, between a given verb and an agent which denotes the name of a rational being. If the agent shall denote the name of an animal not rational, these rules will be still applicable with diminished force; that is to say, the number of exceptions to each rule will be considerably augmented. Perhaps, in some cases, the exceptions may be equally numerous with the examples which corroborate the application of the rule. Examples: *اسبان رسیدند*.

اسب و گاو "The horses are come;" *اسبان رسیدند* very rarely

اسب و گاو رسیدند rarely "The horses and cattle arrived;"

دو اسب رسیدند or *دو اسب رسیدند* "Two horses are come;"

گوسفند رسیدند rarely *گوسفند رسیدند* (equally accurate;)

Y y

"A flock

“ A flock of sheep or goats are come; ” *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ* or *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ*
 “ All the cattle are arrived; ” (equally accurate) *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ*
 rarely *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ* “ Every bird,” or “ All the birds flew
 away; ” *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ* very seldom *كُلُّ الْغَنَمِ كَامَدَتْ* “ The cow
 is come with her calf; &c.

RULE SIXTEENTH.

If the agent shall be the name of an inanimate object in the plural number, and more especially, if it shall assume the animate form of the plural in *ان*, the verb may assume the plural number. The singular number will yet be most commonly retained in this case; and more especially if the noun shall assume the plural in *ت*, or any form of the Arabic plural. Examples; *دَرْخَانِ شِگُفْتَنَدَ* or *دَرْخَانِ شِگُفْتَنَدَ* “ The trees have bloomed; ” *دَرْخَانِ شِگُفْتَنَدَ* or in the words of JAMEE, *دَرْخَانِ شِگُفْتَنَدَ* “ The flowers of the garden have passed away; ” *دَرْخَانِ شِگُفْتَنَدَ* “ The joyful tidings have been received that the season of grief (literally the days of grief) will pass away; ” &c.

RULE SEVENTEENTH.

If the agent, being the name of an inanimate object, shall be connected with others by the intervention of copulative conjunctions, the verb may assume either number but the singular number will be generally retained. Examples; *کَرْدَنَدِ غَارِبَتِ دِلِ وَجَانِ مَارِضِ وَلَبَتِ* “ Your beauty has deprived my soul of rest; ” *کَرْدَنَدِ غَارِبَتِ دِلِ وَجَانِ مَارِضِ وَلَبَتِ* “ Its tulip and hyacinths have resumed their verdure.” The same rule is applicable, when the agent of the verb shall happen to be multiplied by means of a noun of number. Examples; *دَوَ حَسْبِ مَرَا بَرِ شُگُفْتَنَدَ* or in the language of SAUDER, *دَوَ حَسْبِ مَرَا بَرِ شُگُفْتَنَدَ*

این دو چیزم بر من بسیار متعجبند "These two things have excited me to sin;" &c. And in every other case but those stated in this and the preceeding rule, the singular number will be almost invariably retained after an agent denoting the name of an inanimate object.

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

THE word أَهْل and other words of the same nature, when followed by a given substantive noun, will form an attribute applicable to rational beings: as أَهْلٌ تَقْوَى "The pious;" أَهْلٌ صَفَا "The pure;" أَهْلٌ دَوْلَت "The great, noble, fortunate;" &c. This word, when so used, generally requires the verb to be in the plural number: as أَهْلٌ تَقْوَى جَمِيعٌ كُتِبَ "The pious say" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE nothing more to remark on the nature and application of the فاعِل to the purposes of speech. This noun is very nearly connected with the مُبْتَدَأ, and the rules of concord which I have applied to either, are no doubt equally applicable to both. Their insertion under both heads is indeed distinguished by nothing but the difference of arrangement, or the additional information which, under the last head, farther reflexion has enabled me to supply.

THE following observation should be made somewhere, and may be as well inserted here as any where else; though it is equally applicable to every part of this book. An opinion is generally entertained that Grammar should be seldom or never indebted for an example to the language of the poets; because the language of poetry differs, in every country, from that of prose. I believe the difference between them to be very inconsiderable, and to consist chiefly in the inverted arrangement of words which takes

takes place in poetry ; a subject of little or no importance in the Persian Language. For example : The rules of concord which are applicable to prose are unquestionably applicable to poetry also ; as well in the Persian, as in every other tongue. I conceive, therefore, that Grammar may be very reasonably indebted for its examples to the language of the Poets, and I have accordingly not scrupled to have recourse to their authority on every occasion. Examples drawn from the Poets have this advantage, that the measure of the verse generally prevents the possibility of disputing their accuracy, which might be easily disputed if they were selected from the writings of an author in prose. Thus the measure of the following verse necessarily requires that the word **طَلَسَد** should preserve the singular number **طَلَسَد رُوْزِ بَیْهَمِی طَلَسَد زِینِ اَیَّام** ; whereas it would be doubtful, if the same expressions had occurred in prose, whether the singular had not been erroneously substituted by the transcriber for the plural number.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

مَقْعُولٌ نَلَمْ یَسْمَ فَا عَسَلَه

OR

NOMINATIVE TO A VERB IN THE PASSIVE VOICE.

THE nominative to a verb in the passive voice is invariably the same noun which forms the accusative or object to the transitive verb ; and hence it is known to the Arabian Grammarians by the term **مَقْعُولٌ نَلَمْ یَسْمَ فَا عَسَلَه**, that is to say, “ The object to a verb of which the agent is not expressed.” The agent however may doubtless be accurately expressed, as when we affirm that “ JAMES was beaten by JOHN ;” &c. but the agent, which is the nominative to the active verb, will never be the nominative to the passive verb ; and this is probably all that is meant by the Arabian

Arabian Grammarians, though it is also true that the agent seldom accompanies an Arabic or a Persian verb in the passive voice. The nominative to a passive verb is sometimes termed **قائم مقام فاعل** "The substitute of the agent," because the grammatical character of both is exactly the same: that is to say, the one is the nominative to an active verb, as the other is the nominative to a passive verb. When we affirm for example, that "JAMES loveth JOHN," it is clear that JOHN, the object of the active verb, will become the nominative to the passive verb; as "JOHN is loved by JAMES," and other examples of the same nature.

BUT certain verbs, in every language, require to be followed by two or more objects, as when we affirm that "JAMES presented a horse to JOHN;" and in this case, it will depend on the idiom of a given language, which of these nouns shall be the nominative to the verb in the passive voice. The idiom of the Arabic Language necessarily requires that the second object of the transitive verb shall be invariably selected for that purpose; as **أَعْطَى زَيْدٌ بُكْرًا فَرَسًا** "ZYDE presented a horse to BUKR;" **أُعْطِيَ بُكْرٌ فَرَسًا** "BUKR was presented with a horse;" &c. The idiom of the Persian Language necessarily requires the selection of the first object in every example of this nature; as **زید اسبی را به بکر بخشید** "ZYDE presented a horse to BUKR;" **اسبی به بکر بخشیده شد** "A horse was presented to BUKR;" &c. And the idiom of the English Language admits the selection of either noun; since it seems to be a matter of no importance whether we say that "The horse was presented to ZYDE;" or that "ZYDE was presented with the horse."

It may be inferred therefore that the first object of every transitive verb, whether that object shall be a simple substantive noun or the sense of a sentence, (for many verbs are obviously transitive to the sense of a sentence) will be invariably selected, in the Persian Language, to form the nominative to a verb in the passive voice.

Z z

voice.

voice. And hence it follows that the sentence following the particle *که* *That*, will be assumed as the nominative to the passive verb in the following and other examples of the same nature :
 زید با بکر فرمود که شتر را خدمت بخمارد "ZYDE ordered BUKR to perform the duties of service"
 با بکر فرموده شد که شتر را خدمت بخمارد "Orders were given to BUKR that he should perform the duties of service," or "The performance of these duties was imposed upon BUKR."—* The idiom of the English Language generally leads us, in this case, to assume the word BUKR as the nominative to the verb in the passive voice: "BUKR was ordered to perform the duties of service;" a mode of construction which is altogether inadmissible in the Persian Tongue.

WHEN we affirm that "ZYDE knew, found, thought, or believed, AMR to be wise or virtuous," &c. there are two modes in which the sentiment may be accurately expressed in the Persian Language, whether by the aid of an active or a passive verb. *First*, it may be expressed by having recourse to a sentence following the particle *که* *That*; and this mode of construction is the most common; as
 زید دانست که عسکر دانا است "ZYDE knew AMR to be wise;"
 دانسته شد که عسکر دانا است "It became known that AMR is wise;" or, *secondly*, the *Musder* or the *Hafile Musder* may be accurately employed in this case; a mode of construction which is much less common than the former among the writers of Persia.

* It is to be observed that the particle *که* *That*, when prefixed to the tenses of a given verb, has the effect of converting those tenses into the sense of the infinitive or the *Hafile Musder*; that is to say, into the sense of the infinitive or its corresponding substantive noun. For whether we say, "It was requested of BUKR that he should perform a given duty," or "The performance of a given duty was requested of BUKR," or "It was requested of BUKR (BUKR was requested) to perform a given duty," it is obvious that the sense is the same in every case. And hence it may be inferred that the regimen of a given sentence following the particle *که* *That*, is precisely the same with the regimen of a simple substantive noun; or, in other words, that either is susceptible of the same grammatical characters which are applicable to the other, since either may be the agent or the object of a given verb; &c. &c.

Examples :

Examples: زید دانای عمر دانست "ZYDE knew the wisdom of AMR;" دانای بودن عمر دانسته شد "The wisdom of AMR became known;" &c. It should be observed that though the idiom of the English Language admits the assumption of AMR as the nominative to the verb in the passive voice, "AMR was known to be wise;" the same form of construction is wholly inadmissible in the Persian Tongue.

It sometimes happens that either of two nouns may be indifferently assumed as the first (the other being the second) object of a transitive verb; as when we affirm that "The minister appointed a certain person to a given office;" or "that he appointed, that is to say gave, the office to a certain person." Both these forms of speech are indiscriminately employed in the Persian Language; though it is more respectful perhaps, in speaking of an officer of state, to say that an office was appointed or given to him, than it would be to say that "he was appointed to a given office." In this case, the office or the person may indifferently become the nominative to the verb

in the passive voice. Examples: زید بکر را بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرد "ZYDE appointed BUKR to the office of ambassador;"

زید خدمت سفارت را به بکر مقرر کرد "ZYDE appointed or gave the office of ambassador to BUKR;" بکر بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرده شد

"BUKR was appointed to the office of ambassador;"

خدمت سفارت به بکر مقرر کرده شد "The office of ambassador was appointed or given to BUKR;" &c. Among the later

Persian writers, some examples may be observed of the retention, after the nominative to a verb in the passive voice, of that preposition or termination which marks the object of the transitive

verb: as زید را بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرده شد "ZYDE was appointed to the office of ambassador." But this mode of construction is of rare occurrence, and it seems to me that of the termina-

tion

tion (زید را) , or the preposition به (بخت مت) , the one or the other should be omitted as erroneous*.

THE فاعِل or AGENT seldom accompanies a Persian verb in the passive voice ; or, if it should be expressed, it will generally require the intervention of a substantive noun between itself and the preposition with which it is connected. We cannot, for example, say in the Persian Language that "ZYDE was killed by AMR;" for the words زید از عمر شته شد would be absolute nonsense: but we may accurately say زید از دستِ عمر شته شد "ZYDE was killed by the hand of AMR;" زید از شمشیرِ عمر شته شد "ZYDE was killed by the sword of AMR;" because the required substantive noun (دست or شمشیر) intervenes here between the agent and the preposition with which it is connected.

* In the following example from the *Bakaurd Daunish*, I believe the insertion of the termination را after مَطْلَبِي (مَطْلَبِي را) may be accounted for, on the supposition that the word مَطْلَبِي, followed by the relative clause of the sentence, forms the accusative or object of the verb دانست. In this case, the sense of the sentence will run thus: "En NUZRA perceiving that her curiosity was excited to the uttermost, and (perceiving also) the object which he had in view, (that it) was leavened or accomplished, cunningly represented," &c. The words "perceiving the object that it was accomplished," mean merely, "perceiving that the object was accomplished;" and this form of construction is of common occurrence in the Persian Language. If this explanation shall not be admitted, it must, I suppose, be inferred that the word مَطْلَبِي is the nominative to the verb شته شد was leavened or accomplished, in the passive voice; in which case, the termination را had better have been omitted in my opinion. But no well informed native will admit that there is here any inaccuracy in the insertion of that termination, and I do not know that we have any right to dogmatise on the subject. The following is the example to which I allude:—

بی نظیر چون دانست که مشونی در کمال استیلا است و مطلبی را که درین ضمن
منظم نظر دارد محسوس شده از روی عیاری بقرص رب نیکد که

THE

THE rules that regard the position or the omission of the **مفعول به**, as well as its concord with a given verb, are equally applicable to the **مفعول مالم نيسم فاعله**; and need not therefore be repeated in this place. I now proceed to detail the rules that relate to the **مفعول به** OF PROPER OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

SECTION FIRST.

مفعول به

OR

OBJECT OF AN ACTIVE AND TRANSITIVE VERB.

THE **مفعول به** has been defined, by the Arabian Grammarians, to be that noun to which a verb is transitive; or that noun which suffers the action of a transitive verb. Now a verb may be transitive in its own right; as when we say of **ЗЫДЕ**, that “H: hath beaten **БУКР**,” or, being naturally intransitive, it may yet become transitive by the means of certain prepositions; as “The hounds *run down* the hare;” “The birds *flew through* (or pierced) the air;” and other examples of the same nature. If the reader should be of opinion that the verbs here noticed are *not* rendered transitive to the following substantive nouns, by means of the prepositions with which they are connected, I shall be well disposed to concede the point in dispute between us; *first*, because I am not absolutely certain of the accuracy of the proposition here stated; and, *secondly*, because I wish to consider, in this chapter, the objects of those verbs only, which are admitted to be transitive in their own right. For there is not, perhaps, a single verb of the transitive or intransitive class, which does not require to be connected with various substantive nouns by means of the intervention of certain prepositions; as when we affirm of

A a a

an

an individual that "He slept *in* his bed last night," that is to say, *during* last night; or that "He arrived *at* the end of his journey this morning," that is to say, *in* the morning; &c. &c. And as it would be absurd to affirm that the intransitive verbs here noticed are transitive to *any*, or to *all* the substantive nouns by which they are followed; so it will be convenient at least, though not perhaps unexceptionably accurate, to consider intransitive verbs as having no right to assume a transitive character on any occasion.

THE term مَفْعُول has been indifferently applied, by the Arabian Grammarians, to most of the substantive nouns of every kind that may happen to be connected with a given verb, whether transitive or otherwise; and the various species of nouns to which this term is deemed to be applicable, have been recognised by them to amount to the number of five; namely, *first*, the مَفْعُول بِهِ or OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB; as ضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا "I struck ZYDE;" *secondly*, the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق or UNIVERSAL OBJECT, which is supposed to be common to all verbs in the Arabic Language without exception; as ضَرَبْتُ فَرَسًا "I beat (or gave) a beating;" *thirdly*, the مَفْعُول فِيهِ or that noun which denotes the name of A GIVEN TIME OR A GIVEN PLACE in which the action of a verb is stated to occur; as سَافَرْتُ شَهْرًا "I travelled *during* a month;" جَلَسْتُ فِي الْبَيْتِ "I sat down *in* the house;" *fourthly*, the مَفْعُول لَهُ or that noun which denotes the CAUSE of the action of a given verb; as ضَرَبْتُهُ تَأْدِيبًا "I beat him for the purpose of correction," or "in order to correct him;" and, *finally*, the مَفْعُول مَعَهُ or that noun which follows the particle وَ signifying *with*; as جِئْتُ أَنَا وَ زَيْدًا "I came *with* ZYDE;" &c.* In most of these examples (though not in them all) the مَفْعُول

* The مَفْعُول لَهُ occurs not unfrequently in the Persian Language; as اِنْتَهَا "I have represented this for your information;" &c.

is connected with its proper verb, not by the intervention of prepositions, but by the means of case; that is to say, by putting the nouns to which that term is applicable into the objective case. To this cause I am disposed to ascribe the fact which I have just now stated; *namely*, that the Arabian Grammarians have determined the term *مفعول* or "object of the verb," to be applicable to them all.

IN the Persian Language I propose to comprise under the term *مفعول*; *first*, the *مفعول به* or "OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB," which forms the subject of the present section of this chapter; and, *secondly*, the *مفعول متبني* or "UNIVERSAL OBJECT," which will be the subject of discussion in another section. Most of the other nouns to which I have adverted may be classed promiscuously under the general term *مفعول*, or nouns connected with the verb; and as the idiom of the Persian Language generally requires that this connexion should be established by means of prepositions, so the *sense* of those prepositions will sufficiently determine the nature of the relation that may exist between them. It follows therefore that the consideration of the *مفعول* may be altogether omitted in this part of the work; *first*, because the nature of the relation existing between them and a given verb must be necessarily determined by the sense of the preposition that may happen to be employed on a given occasion; and, *secondly*, because the sense of all the prepositions will be fully considered hereafter when we shall have occasion to treat of Persian Particles. The *حال*, the *متمم خبر* and the *نِدَا* will, however, be considered by themselves.

THE object of a transitive verb may be generally known to be that noun which is described by the passive participle of the same verb; as when we affirm that "ZYDE beateth BUKR;" in which case BUKR is described by the participle BEATEN; that is to say,
he

he is the person *beaten* by ZYDE. We must be careful however to add no preposition or other word to the passive participle of the transitive verb; because it will often, in that case, become applicable to the *موصوف* that is to say, to other nouns besides that noun to which the verb is transitive in the active voice. If it be affirmed, for example, that "ZYDE presented (or gave) a horse to BUKR;" the horse is clearly *the thing given*; and consequently the object of the transitive verb. BUKR is the person *to whom* (it is) *given*; and he is merely the *موصوف* or noun connected with the verb; and not the true object of the verb, in the sense in which the term "object" is now used,

IN the Persian Language, the object of a transitive verb is often followed by the termination *را*; but that termination is also employed for other purposes; and its insertion for the purpose here stated, namely, that of marking the object of a transitive verb, is by no means necessary, or even admissible, on every occasion. The following are all the rules regarding the position, omission or insertion of the termination *را*, which I have been able to collect in the Persian Language.

R U L E F I R S T.

WHEN the object of a transitive verb shall not be followed by an adjective, or by a substantive noun with which it is connected, the termination *را*, if it shall be expressed, will necessarily follow the object of the transitive verb. Example; *فان را دیدم* "I saw such a man;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

IF the object of the transitive verb shall be followed by an adjective, or by one or more substantive nouns with which it is connected, the termination *را* will generally follow these words.

Example: *زید پسر فان را دیدم* "I saw ZYDE, the son of such

such a man." But in poetry, if the measure of the verse require it, the termination *را* will sometimes (though very rarely) occur between a substantive and the following adjective noun, or between one substantive and another with which, as an attributive, it may happen to be connected. Example: *دوستان را از یکدیگر جدا سازد* for *دوستان متبیل را از یکدیگر جدا سازد* "She (Fortune) separates the friends that are near to each other." It is to be observed, however, that the word *متبیل* is sometimes adverbially used to signify *میشم* *Constantly*, or *Always*; and if it be here so used, the sense of the passage will stand as follows: "She (Fortune) constantly separates mutual friends." Or the word *متبیل* may be the *حال*, to which *دوستان* is the *مؤخر* according to the explanation of those terms, inserted in a subsequent chapter of this work. In either of these cases, the example in question will be insufficient to establish the proposition advanced in the rule: *namely*, that the particle *را* is sometimes inserted between a given substantive and the following adjective noun. And in truth I have some doubts with regard to the accuracy of this proposition, of which, to say the least, the examples are of very rare occurrence in the Persian Language. Of the occurrence of the particle *را* between the *مفعول به* and the following *substantive* noun with which it is connected by the intervention of the vowel *کسره* *توصیفی*, it would be easy to *make* an example, such as *زید پسر فلان دیدم* for *زید را پسر فلان دیدم* "I saw ZYDE the son of such a person;" but the introduction of *را* between *زید* and *پسر* is inadmissible in my opinion, because I do not believe that it can be supported by a single authority of classical eminence.

R U L E T H I R D.

If the *مفعول به* shall be one of a given tribe or multitude occurring before and after the preposition *از*, the termination *را*

B b b

may

may then be accurately inserted after the ^{oraz}مفعول which occurs before that preposition; or after the generic name of such multitude which will be found to follow that preposition. The ancient writers of Persia, in every respect superior for elegance, purity and simplicity of style, to those who have written in modern times, have generally inserted the termination را immediately after the مفعول به. Example: یکی را از علمادیدم. "I saw one of the learned." And the modern writers commonly insert that termination after the generic noun that may happen to follow the preposition از. Example: یکی از علمادیدم. "I saw one of the learned;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

If the مفعول به shall be followed by a parenthetical sentence occurring between it and the transitive verb with which it is connected, an ancient writer will generally insert the termination را immediately after the مفعول به. Example: بزید را لعنة الله عليه بخواب دیدند. "They saw YUZEED (the curse of God be upon him) in a dream." And in the writings of modern authors, the termination را will generally follow the parenthetical sentence. Example: علی رضی الله عنه را بخواب دیدم. "I saw ALEE (may God be satisfied with him) in a dream."

R U L E F I F T H.

If the مفعول به shall be a ^{مفصل}مفصل or *Conjunctive Pronoun*, the insertion of را will be wholly inadmissible on every occasion. Examples: زدَم زِدَم "ZYDE beat me;" بگرفت رهنبری نمود "BUKZ guided thee," or "BUKZ was thy guide;" &c.

R U L E

RULE SIXTH.

If the *مفعول به* shall be a *متمم منفصل* or *Disjunctive Pronoun*, the termination *ا* must be invariably inserted on every occasion. Examples: *مَرَأَاؤُرُو* "He brought me;" *مَرَأَاؤُرُو* "He beat thee;" &c. The same rule is applicable to the pronoun *نَحْوُ*, as well as to the demonstrative nouns, and to the word *فَوْن*, when these words (occurring in a sentence as the *مفعول به*) shall be unaccompanied by common substantive nouns. Examples: *نَحْوُ رَا كُتْ* "He killed himself;" *اَيْنَ رَا خَسِرَ يَدَم* "I purchased this;" *اَتَرَاوِ يَدَم* "I saw that;" *فَوْن رَا اَتَجَا نَه بَرَدَم* "I carried such a person to my house," &c. But if they shall happen to be followed by the common substantive nouns, as *فَوْن كَس*; *اَن جِسَر*; &c. the insertion or omission of the termination *ا* will then depend on the rules (about to be detailed) which are applicable to common substantive nouns.

RULE SEVENTH.

If the *مفعول به* shall be a common substantive noun, the termination *ا* will be generally inserted, whenever the agent and the object of the verb shall both be the names of rational beings. Examples: *زَيْدُ بَكْرَ رَا كُتْ* "ZYDE killed BUKR;" *زَيْدُ كَسِي رَا نَزَدَمَن فِر شَنَاو* "ZYDE sent somebody to me;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

If the agent and the object of a given verb shall happen to be the names of animals not rational, the termination *ا* will be generally inserted. Example: *اَسْمُورْ كَسِي شَوْت بَنَدِي رَا يَد بَرِيد* "A wolf tore a lamb;" &c.

RULE

RULE NINTH.

If the agent and the object of a given verb shall belong to the class of inanimated nouns, the termination را will be generally inferred. Examples: **میری قہار بی اشتیاق شایبائی را دُور رُود** "The ardour of my attachment (or desire to see you) has exhausted my patience," **عشق عقل را بختون آورد** "Love has reduced reason to madness," &c.

RULE TENTH.

Of the agent and the object of a given verb, either may be the name of a rational being, and the other may be the name of an animal not rational. In this case the termination *l*, will be generally inserted, if the verb shall denote an action of such a nature as may possibly proceed from either noun. Examples:

بشیر زید را کشت "ZYDE killed the tyger;"
 "The tyger killed ZYDE;" &c.

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the agent of the verb shall not belong to the class of animated beings, the termination *l*, will be generally inserted whenever the object shall be the name of an animal.

Examples: "Worldly cares destroyed" اَفْكَارِ دُنْيَوِی زَبَدِ رَا كَشْت
 "The itch killed the horse," &c. خَارِشِ اسْب رَا كَشْت ZYDE;

R U L E T W E L F T H.

In the case of a verb denoting an action peculiar to rational beings, as *purchase* or *sale*; the termination *ل*, will be generally omitted if the object shall be the name of an animal not rational; or of a slave, who forms like such animals, a part of the property of his master. Examples: *فُيِّنَ مَعَهُمْ خَيْرٌ يَدَم* "I bought

bought such a slave;" زید استب خود قسروخت "ZYDE sold his horse;" &c. The infertion, however, of the termination ر, will be generally (and perhaps invariably) optional in this case.

R U L E T H I R T E E N T H.

If the agent of the verb shall belong to the class of animated beings, the termination ر will be very generally omitted when the object shall not be the name of an animal. The examples of the operation of this rule are very numerous; the exceptions are comparatively speaking of rare occurrence; and the infertion of the termination ر will clearly appear to be very inelegant, perhaps inaccurate, in most, or at least in many cases. Though that termination should be omitted, it is here inserted, after each example, between parentheses; in order to shew, by the effect of contrast, the impression resulting from its omission or utterance on a practised ear. Generally speaking (though not certainly in every case) it cannot be uttered without exciting in the mind of a Persian scholar, a sensation of dissonance not much unlike that which results in music from a false concord: a clear proof that it must be generally omitted. Examples: "Whoever spends his life in vain;" زنی فساد همر که عمر (را) در پاخت "Whoever spends his life in vain;" چسری (را) نخرید و زر (را) پسنداشت "Has thrown away his money and purchased nothing." "O my son learn wisdom and virtue;" آئی پسر عقل و ادب (را) پیش گیر "And leave off idleness and vain pursuits;" و نهو و لعب (را) بگذار "که چون نعمت ببری شود تنجی (را) ببری" "For when your wealth shall be expended, you will suffer misfortunes and experience repentance;" "He turned his face to the wilderness;" سر (را) در بیابان نهاد "And dropt from his hand the reins of self command." وز نام اختیار (را) از دست داد "I have no garment;" جامه (را) ندارم

C c c

garment ; " وَاَمِنْ (رَا) اَزْ نَجَبِ اَرَم " Where then shall I find a lapper ; " فَسِرْ بِيْبِ دُشْمَنِ (رَا) مَحْوَر " Be not blind to the wiles of your enemies ; " وَنَحْشِرْ دُرْ مَدَاحِ (رَا) مَحْشَر " And beware of the pride inspired by the flatterer ; " كِهْ اَنْ دَايْمِ زَرْقِي (رَا) نَبَا دَه " For the one has spread the snare of hypocrisy ; " (رَا) اَشْشَا دَه " And the other has opened the mouth of avidity ; " &c. &c. &c. The termination رَا is nevertheless inserted occasionally in this case. Example from JAUMER : " مُوَجِبِ اَنْ رَا هَرْ سِيْدِم " I asked the cause of this." Many other examples might be adduced.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

If both nouns shall belong to the class of inanimated objects, the termination رَا will be generally omitted, whenever the object shall result from the agent, as every effect results from its cause. Examples : " دُرْخْتِ بَرِّ (رَا) گِرِ فِت " The tree produced fruit ; " مُلْكِ اَزْ خِرَسَرْدِ مَثْدَانِ هِمَالِ (رَا) پَنْدِرْد " A kingdom is improved by the administration of wise rulers." There are some exceptions to this rule, which forms, itself, an exception to the ninth rule.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

THOSE nouns (generally of the inanimate class) which are compounded with Persian auxiliaries, such as کَرْدَن, مَآخِژَن, مَنُوْدَن, &c. require the omission of the termination رَا : as سَبَرِ کَرْدَن To plunder ; سَخَنِ کَرْدَن To speak ; سَمَشِیرِ زَدَن To travel ; تَا زَبَانَه زَدَن To slog ; سَمَشِیرِ زَدَن To strike with a sword ; رُو زَه دَا شْتَن To fast ; &c. &c. And the nouns connected with those compounded verbs, require occasionally the termination رَا ; as زَبَدِ رَا نَا رَتِ کَرْدَن " To plunder ZYDE ; or some of the prepositions ; as بَا زَبَدِ عَسَدِ کَرْدَن To practise treachery against

against ZYDE ; &c. In the case of a verb requiring two objects, the termination *را*, or some of the prepositions, will be required to mark the first object ; and the second object will admit of no adjunct of any kind. Example : زَيْدٌ رَأَى زَوْجَهُ خَبِيْثًا "I gave money to ZYDE ;" &c.

R E M A R K S.

IT seems to me that the first component part of most compounded verbs, forms a species of the *مَفْعُولٌ مُطْلَقٌ* to any given auxiliary with which it may happen to be occasionally connected. And as the *مَفْعُولٌ مُطْلَقٌ* is never followed by the termination *را*, so these nouns also, require the omission of that termination. To explain by an example. The verb *كَرَدَ* signifies *To do* or *To perform* ; that is to say, it denotes *action* of any kind. The word *غَارَت* on the contrary denotes a *specific action* signified by the word *plunder* in our Language ; and hence it follows, that the compounded verb *كَرَدَ غَارَت* signifies "To perform the action of plunder ;" that is to say, the term *غَارَت* is merely used to *specify* or *define* the general idea signified by the verb *كَرَدَ* *To do*. The idea signified by this verb is indeed so very general as to be applicable to all actions without exception ; and the Arabian Grammarians have accordingly declared that the name of any action may be accurately compounded with this verb : as زَيْدٌ فَعَلَ الْقَرْبَ "ZYDE beat ;" "ZYDE performed the action of beating ;" &c. That the *مَفْعُولٌ مُطْلَقٌ* is often used to specify the *kind of action* signified by its own verb, is well known to every Arabic scholar ; as جَلَسْتُ جُلَّةً "I sat down in a certain way ;" &c.

R U L E S I X T E E N T H.

IF the same noun shall be respectively the agent and the object of two verbs, united together by the means of a conjunction, the government

government will be given to the nearest verb. If that verb shall require the nominative, the termination *ر* will be therefore omitted; and if the accusative shall be required, the termination *ر* will be generally inserted. Examples: *دوست را خواندم و نزد من آمد* " I called my friend and he came accordingly; " *زدم من و زد مرا زید* " I beat ZYDE and he beat me; " *زد مرا و زد من زید را* " ZYDE beat me and I beat him; " &c. I have often had occasion to observe that the nominative is seldom the last member of a Persian sentence, and the two last examples are, in fact, more consonant to Arabic than to Persian idiom.

R U L E S E V E N T E E N T H.

EVERY sentence comprising a Relative Pronoun must contain two verbs; of which the same antecedent may be the nominative to both, or the accusative to both, or the nominative to either, and the accusative to the other; &c. &c. as detailed in the chapter that treats of Relative Pronouns. If the same antecedent shall be the nominative to the first, and the accusative to the second verb, the termination *ر* will be generally omitted after the antecedent, of which the pronominal name will be commonly expressed (though it may be omitted) in the predicate of the proposition. Example: *یار منی که دلم بر او دیدم* " The friend or mistress who has possession of my heart I have seen him or her; " or more rarely, *یار منی که دلم بر او دیدم* " The friend who has possession of my heart I have seen." If the termination *ر* shall be inserted after the antecedent, the pronominal name of the latter must be necessarily omitted in the predicate of the proposition. Example: *یار منی را که دلم بر او دیدم* " I saw the friend who has possession of my heart." To say *یار منی را که دلم بر او دیدم دیدم* would be obviously improper, because the verb *دیدم* would then govern, at once, the antecedent itself and its pronominal name.

RULE

R U L E E I G H T E E N T H.

If the same antecedent shall be the accusative to the first verb, and the nominative to the second, the termination *ر* will be generally inserted after the antecedent; of which the pronominal name will be most commonly omitted (though it may be inserted) in the predicate of the proposition. Example:

دوستی را که به غسیری فراچنگ آوردم. یک دم از دستم رفت (or, more

rarely, (اوستیک و دم از دستم رفت) "The friend whom I obtained in an age has been lost in a moment." If the termination *ر*, shall not be inserted after the antecedent, the pronominal name of the latter will be commonly inserted (though it may be omitted) in the relative clause. Example:

بازیگری که می جستندش نزد من آمد (or

more rarely (بازیگری که می جستندم نزد من آمد) "The friend whom I was looking for has come to me."

C O N C L U S I O N.

THE preceding are all the rules, regarding the insertion or omission of the termination *ر*, that I have been able to collect in the Persian Language. They are applicable, only when that termination is employed to mark the object of a transitive verb; for if

it shall be employed for any other purpose, (as یکی را می گفتند "They speak of a certain person;" هزار و پست هزار اش می خریدم

"I purchased a horse for a thousand rupees;" &c. &c.) its insertion will be indispensibly necessary on every occasion; unless, indeed, we shall supply its place by the insertion of some other particle having the same, or nearly the same sense. The use of the termination *ر*, when not employed to mark the object of a transitive verb, will be considered hereafter, when we have occasion to treat of Persian particles. In the mean time, I think it necessary to state some general principles which may, in my opinion, be accurately deduced from the preceding rules.

D d d

I T

It must be observed that there are many exceptions to the seventh and following rules; but those exceptions have not been detailed in this work, because they may be generally referred to the following principle, which forms the basis of all the rules; namely, that the insertion of the termination ۱ ر, though generally optional, is seldom necessary, but for the purpose of *dispelling some obscurity*, which the omission of that termination might tend to create in the structure of a sentence. To explain by examples. It is certain that a man may kill a tyger, and that a tyger also may kill a man; or in other words, that either noun may be accurately assumed as the agent or object of the verb *To kill*. And hence it follows that the termination ۱ ر must be inserted in the following example: زید بَشیر را کُشت “ZYDE killed the tyger;” because it would be otherwise difficult to determine whether ZYDE is the agent or the object of the verb. But if the verb shall assume the first person (بَشیری کُشتم “I killed a tyger;”) or if our previous knowledge of things shall enable us with certainty to distinguish the agent from the object of a given verb, (گوسفندی بدرد (“A wolf tore a lamb;”) the omission of the termination ۱ ر will be optional to the speaker in either case; because it is of importance, only, to prevent obscurity; and the means of its prevention are of no importance. I repeat, therefore, that the termination ۱ ر must be inserted in every doubtful case; and that the omission of that termination is generally optional, and sometimes necessary, whenever its omission shall not be the cause of producing obscurity in the structure of a sentence.

If, however, the termination ۱ ر shall be omitted in opposition to the principle here stated; as زید بَشیر کُشت “ZYDE killed the tyger;” it may yet be determined, on general principles, that the first noun (زید) is the nominative to the verb: because the nominative is generally the first member of a Persian sentence.

sentences. But as the Persian Language admits of more latitude than most others, in the arrangement of the words composing a sentence, so, this criterion is the most imperfect that can be imagined; and those who desire to attain perspicuity of style, will do well to furnish their readers with better means of discovering the sense which they desire to express, than are to be drawn from the contemplation, simply, of the order of speech. Having stated that the omission of the termination ۱) is generally optional, and some times necessary, whenever its omission shall not be detrimental to the perspicuity of a sentence; it is obvious to observe that the term *optional* implies the liberty of inserting the termination ۱), which will, accordingly, be often inserted in such cases.

I now proceed to consider the accordance of the rules which I have detailed, with that general principle, just mentioned, which is stated to form the basis of them all.

ON reference to the SEVENTH, EIGHTH, and NINTH RULES, the reader will perceive that the termination ۱) must be generally inserted, whenever the agent and the object of a verb shall be substantive nouns of the same class. And those rules are at once referable to the principle for which I contend; because, of two given substantive nouns of the same class, it will generally happen that either may be accurately assumed as the agent or object of the same verb. If both nouns shall belong to the class of RATIONAL BEINGS, for example, it is clear that either may *love*, *hate*, *beat* or *kill*, the other, &c. &c. from which it follows that the omission in this case of the termination ۱), would be generally productive of obscurity in the structure of the sentence.

If, on the contrary, the agent and the object of a given verb shall not be substantive nouns of the same class; as for example, if one shall be the name of a RATIONAL BEING, and the other of an ANIMAL NOT RATIONAL; the context will be often sufficient to distinguish

tinguish the agent from the object of the verb, without the aid of the termination ۱۱. But if it shall not be sufficient for that purpose, (as in the case stated in the TENTH RULE,) the termination ۱۱ will then be inserted; and thus the TENTH RULE, tends to confirm the accuracy of the general principle to which I have now adverted. The same observations are applicable to the TWELFTH, THIRTEENTH and FOURTEENTH RULES; and, generally speaking, to all the exceptions from all the rules; since it will be found that the termination ۱۱ is scarcely ever omitted, except in cases where its insertion is not required for the purpose of adding to the perspicuity of a sentence.

IN such cases, it is to be expected that the insertion of this termination will be sometimes elegant, and sometimes optional or inadmissible. It will be elegant, for example, in the following proposition: *مگر کسی گوسفندی را بدرید*; because, though its insertion is not here necessary for the purpose of perspicuity, it is *generally* necessary for that purpose, in other propositions of the same class. And it will be at least inelegant, or perhaps inadmissible, in the following proposition: *چون نعمت سیبری شود سبزی را بری*; because its insertion is not necessary for the purpose of perspicuity, either in this proposition; or, generally speaking, in other propositions of the same class.

IT only remains to account for the case stated in the ELEVENTH RULE: *namely*, that the termination ۱۱ will be generally inserted in the following and other examples of the same nature: *خارش اسب را کشت* "The itch killed the horse;" &c. It must be admitted, that the omission in this case of the termination ۱۱, would not be generally the cause of producing obscurity in the structure of the sentence; and the necessity of its insertion must be therefore referred, in all probability, to another principle. It seems, according to reason, to be the province of animals to perform

perform actions, and not the province of inanimate nouns: and if an inanimate noun shall be assumed as the agent to a verb, of which the object is the name of an animal, this is a perversion of the order of nature, which must be marked by the insertion of the termination *را*. The operation of this principle (plausible at least, if not convincing) is, in my judgment, strongly confirmed by the following observation: namely, that the termination *را* must be generally omitted (see RULE THIRTEENTH) whenever the name of an animal shall be assumed as the agent to a verb, of which the object does not belong to the class of animated beings.

SIR WILLIAM JONES has described what, if true, would be a very curious effect of the termination *را*; namely, its power of restricting, as a definite article, the substantive noun to which it is imputed: as *گل چیدن* "To gather a (or any) flower," *گل را چیدن* "To gather the (given or particular) flower." I have already remarked (see page 145 of this volume) that there is not, in my judgment, any foundation for the opinion stated by Sir WILLIAM JONES.

BEFORE I conclude the subject of the present section of this chapter, I think it necessary to offer a very few observations, *first*, on the position, and *secondly*, on the occasional omission of the *مفعول به*. The usual arrangement of a Persian sentence requires that the *مفعول به* should take its station between the agent and the verb to which it belongs; but if the verb shall be in the first or second persons, it may be often observed to follow the verb. Example: *یکی از برزخگان ملاح را گفت: آبسیر این هر دو را* "One of the gentlemen said to the boatman, lay hold of these two." If the *مفعول به* shall be a perfect sentence, it must follow the verb to which it belongs. Example: *شیتدم که زید منی آید* "I have heard that ZYDE is coming." And the particle *که* which is generally inserted, is sometimes omitted in such cases.

E c c

Example:

Example: **گیتیم پدرتو است نافع** "I admit (that) your father is learned," &c. The natural arrangement of a Persian sentence may be accurately superseded in verse, or in measured prose, or in order to answer any useful purpose, but though it would be easy to adduce many examples of this nature, they are of too little importance to merit insertion.

NOTWITHSTANDING the verbosity of Persian authors, there is no Language in the world, of which the genius delights more in the abbreviations of speech than the Persian Language. And hence it may be stated as a general rule, that the omission of every word, which is not necessary to the perspicuity of a sentence, will be deemed elegant in Persian composition.

THE **مفعول به** may be elegantly omitted, whenever the omission can be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader.

EXAMPLES.

جوئیل از تو بر آری طاب کند چربی بدیده و گرنه بستم گز بر تو زبانه

"WHEN a beggar demands your charity with weeping and lamentation, give (it to him,) otherwise the oppressor will seize (it) by force."

فرستادند لشکر از همه دیار روانه شود بر در شهریار

"HE sent (orders) to assemble armies around his person, from every part of the Empire."

جوان مردی که بخورد و بدیدد به از عایدی که روز دادر و بدیدد

"A LIBERAL man who enjoys and distributes (his property) is better than a devotee who fasts and accumulates."

If it were of any importance, it would be easy to multiply without end, as well in poetry as in plain prose, the examples of the omission of the *مفعول مطلق*.

SECTION SECOND.

مفعول مطلق

OR

UNIVERSAL OBJECT.

THE *مفعول مطلق* OF UNIVERSAL OBJECT, though of common occurrence in the Arabic Language, is very rarely used in Persian composition. It is defined to be THE INFINITIVE GOVERNED BY ITS OWN VERB, OR BY ANOTHER VERB HAVING THE SAME SENSE; as when we say in English, "He dreamt a dream," "He struck a blow," "He rode a ride," "He died an ignominious death," &c. And as this noun, which is peculiar to a few verbs in our Language, might be reasonably, though not idiomatically, common to them all; so, it is therefore termed by the Arabian Grammarians, the *مفعول مطلق*; or *that object which is (or might be) common to all the verbs of any given Language without exception*. I say it might be common to all the verbs of any given Language, *first*, because the sense of every verb may be accurately modified by means of an adverb; as when we say in English, "He died ignominiously," and *secondly*, because every adverb so employed, may be accurately considered as an adjective applicable to the *مفعول مطلق*; as "He died an ignominious death," and other examples of the same nature.

THE *مفعول مطلق* is employed, in the Arabic Language, *first*, to corroborate the sense of its own verb; in which case it adds no new idea to the sentence: as *جَلَسْتُ جُلُوسًا* "I sat a sitting," that is to say, "I sat," or "I sat down," &c. *secondly*, to restrict

to unity the sense of the verb; as *جَلَسْتُ جَلْسَةً* "I sat down *once*," or *one sitting*; and *finally*, to modify the action of the verb; as *جَلَسْتُ جَلْسَةً* "I sat in a *certain posture*;" &c. In the first sense only, the *مَفْعُولُ مُطْلَق* is generally used in our Language; for if it be affirmed of an individual that "He dreamt a dream," it is obvious that the word *dream* adds nothing to the sense of the preceding verb, since every man who dreams at all, must of necessity dream a dream.

In the Persian Language, the *مَفْعُولُ مُطْلَق* is generally followed by the letter *بِاِي مَجْزُوءٍ*; which may be sometimes a pleonasm; in which case the *مَفْعُولُ مُطْلَق* will merely corroborate, without adding to the sense of the preceding verb; or sometimes it may have the sense of *بِاِي وَحْدَتٍ* or *Ya of Unity*; in which case it will restrict to *unity*, or modify, as above, the action of the verb. I have already stated that the examples of the *مَفْعُولُ مُطْلَق* are of rare occurrence in the Persian Language; and in order to find them, I am under the necessity of having recourse to the Poets. The two following rest on the high authority of NEZAUMEE, a Poet of an admirable genius, too often obscured by the vices of his taste.

بِاِیَاقِی از بادِه بر دَوارِ بَند بِه پَیَمایِ بِیَمُودِی بادِه چَند نظامی

* * * * *

بِجَبیدِ جَبیدِنی بِاِشکوه جَوازِ زلزَلِه کَالِبدِ نایِ کُوه نظامی

I do not chuse to translate these verses, of which the sense will be obvious to every scholar. It may be necessary, however, to state that the second line of the first Example might (accurately as to the sense) be put into the following more simple order: *بِه پَیَمایِ بادِه بِیَمُودِی چَند* "Measure out wine (in) several measurements;" or "Give us repeatedly to quaff the wine."

Or

OF the occurrence of the *مفعول مطلق* followed by the *إضافات* or Genitive case, and destitute of the letter *ي* *يحيى*, the following Example may be cited on the authority of SAADIE.

بَهِ كَرْدُورِ نَجَبَرَه بَرِ مَنْ وَفَب رَنگه كُودِنِ مَالِمِ اَنْدَرِ سَفِيَه

“ THE learned doctor looked on me frowning, as a learned man looks at a fool.”

THE term *مفعول مطلق* may, without much impropriety, be applied to those adverbs or adjective nouns which are employed, in every language, to modify the sense of a given verb. Examples: *سُخْتِ دَوِيدَم* “ I ran swiftly; ” *خُطَامِ زَا سَبَرِ خُورَدَم* “ I eat my fill; ” *اَز حَرَكَتِ او بَسَارِ رَنجِيدَم* “ I was greatly vexed with his conduct; ” &c. In poetry, these adverbs sometimes follow the verb. Example: *بُجُوبَشِيدِ نَشَكِرِ بَاوُشِيدِ سُخْتِ* &c. &c. And it will be remembered, as already stated, that they are truly adjective nouns employed to modify the sense of the infinitive of every verb to which they are imputed.

SECTION THIRD.

مُتَاوَلِي

OR

VOCATIVE.

Nouns in the vocative case are supposed, by the Persian Grammarians, to form one species of the *مفعول* or *object to a transitive verb*; because every noun so employed, might obviously follow a transitive verb in the objective case; since it constitutes, in fact, the person or thing addressed by the speaker: as “ O JAMES; ” “ I call thee JAMES; ” “ O DEATH; ” “ I call thee DEATH; ” &c. &c.

F f f

THE

THE vocative may be formed, in the Persian Language, by adding to the nominative the letter *alif quiescent*; as **خُدَا يَا** O God! **يَا رَا** O my friend! **يَا دُشَا** O my Sovereign! **دُشْتِيَرَا** O my protector! **دِرِيَنَا** Alas! alas! **شَرْنَا** O the pity! &c. This letter, which is seldom added to proper names, is less commonly used in the language than the particle **اي** which may be accurately prefixed to any given substantive or adjective noun without exception: as **اي خُدَا وَنَد** **اي پادشاه** **اي دُشَا** **اي دُشْتِيَرَا** **اي دِرِيَنَا** or **اي دُرُو** **اي مَرُو** **اي دُوشَان** or **اي دِرِيَنَا** &c.

EXAMPLE.

اي دِرِيَنَا اي دِرِيَنَا اي دِرِيَنَا **كَاں چَاَن مَآيِي بَنَان شُد زِيَرِيَنِيَش**

“ ALAS! ALAS! that such a moon as this, should be hidden from our view by the intercepting clouds.”

THE particles **اي** and **يا** are also used to form the vocative case: as **اَيَا شَاهِ مُخْمُودِيَشُو رَحْمَتِي** “ O thou Prince MAHMOOD, the conqueror of kingdoms!” **يَا اَلِهِي بِدِه تُو تَوْفِيَقِم** “ O God grant me grace!” &c. but these particles are, comparatively speaking, of rare occurrence in the Persian Language. To them we may add the word **وَا** as **وَا زِيَد** &c. and the Hindoostanee word **اَرِي** which is employed by SHEFAEE in the following verse: **اَرِي كِبَرِي تُو كِبَا دُرُك كِبَا شِعْر كُوبَا** “ O thou kite, what pretensions hast thou to sense or poetry?” The word **كِبَرِي** is a Relative noun, formed from its primitive **كِبَر** a kite, or a vulture.

THE **حَرْفِ نِدَا** or Vocative particle, or the **مَنْ وَآي** itself, or
Vocative

Vocative case, are often omitted: as

“اُنَى نَمَامِي خَوَابِ مَنِ بَرْدَهُ بِچشمِ نِسَمِ خَوَابِ” “O! you have stolen away my rest, with those eyes melting as in slumber!” *
 “صَبَا بَلَطَفَ بَكْرٍ اَنْ غَزَا لَ رَعَا رَا” “O thou morning breeze! inform, I pray you, that graceful fawn;” &c.

THE sentence which generally accompanies every noun in the vocative case, is termed *جَوَابِ نِدَا*; and in the common order of speech, it ought to follow the *مُسَاوِي*, to which, however, it is sometimes prefixed; as at other times, the *مُسَاوِي* is inserted between the various members of which it is composed. Examples: “اُنَى مَجْلِبَانِ رَا هُ خَرَابَاتِ كَدَامِ اَسْت” “Tell me, my friends, which is the road that leads to the tavern?”
 “رَوَزَنَارِ بَشْدِ اُنَى بُتِ پَرَسْت” “Go thou idolater, and assume the Zoonnaur” (the badge of infidelity; being a string worn by the Brahmans as a mark of their cast;)
 “هزار سختیست اُنَى دُوَسْتِ بَرَمَنِ آسانِ اَسْت” “I can bear with ease, O my beloved, a thousand hardships inflicted by thee!” &c.

* I do not pretend to be able to translate the epithet *چشمِ نِسَمِ خَوَابِ* though it represent, perhaps with more accuracy than any other epithet, that soft and subdued lustre of the female eye, which is so much admired by the Persian Poets. It is curious to observe the wild and wandering fancy of those fantastic children of genius, who have resorted to slumber; (*چشمِ نِسَمِ خَوَابِ*) intoxication; (*چشمِ مَسْت*) and disease; (*چشمِ بَرَمَنِ*) in order to describe the appearances which they admire in the human eye. The *چشمِ مَسْت* denotes, I suppose, the possession by nature of that sparkling intelligence and animation of the eye, which is sometimes the effect of a mind exhilarated but not overpowered by wine. The *چشمِ بَرَمَنِ* denotes, on the contrary, a sort of interesting languor in the eye, often supposed to be natural to the possessor, though it is found sometimes to be the effect of disease.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

SECTION FIRST.

حال

OR

**NOUN EMPLOYED TO DESCRIBE THE STATE OF THE
AGENT OR OBJECT OF A VERB.**

OF the functions performed in speech by the words or materials of which it is composed, there are some that approach so nearly together in their own nature, as to render it difficult, in many cases, to define the difference existing between them. The **حال**, of which I am about to treat, will furnish one example of this kind; for its office is in fact so nearly connected with that of a simple adverb or an adjective noun, that the distinction between them, however obvious in many examples, seems in others to be entirely lost.

In the Arabic Language, which is so constructed as to force on the notice of the learner, many Grammatical niceties which have been generally overlooked in other tongues, the **حال** is distinguished from the **نعت** or **صفة** by means of a case peculiar to itself; and thus the word **راكب**, which is the **نعت** or *attributive* in the following example, **“جاءني رجل راکب”** “A riding man, or a rider came to me,” will assume the objective case (**جاءني راکب راجل”** “A man approached me on horseback;”) when used as the **حال** to describe the state of the agent or nominative to the verb.

In the more simple structure of the Persian Tongue, there is no such thing as the variations of case; and the order of speech, or to speak more accurately, the distinction of sense between the **حال** and the **نعت**, is therefore the only criterion to which on this occasion

occasion we can have recourse. The *حال* is defined by the Arabian Grammarians, to be a noun used to explain the state of the agent or the object of a verb; or of both together; as لَقِيتُ بُكْرًا رَاكِبَيْنِ "I met BUKR, both being on horseback;" &c. &c. But the *حال* may be formed in the Persian Language, *first*, after a noun in the vocative case; as اُمِّي نَسَدَايِ مَا دَا نَا وَبِسَا "O thou our God, who art wise and penetrating!" *secondly*, after the فَارَف as بَجَائِی رَسِیدِیم تَارِکُ و نَیْک "We arrived at a place dark and narrow;" and, *finally*, after the agent or the object, or any other noun without exception that may happen to be connected with a given verb; whether substantive, active, passive, or neuter: as مَرَا یَا رِی اَسْتِ شَیْلِکِیْنِ دِل "I have a mistress with a heart of stone;" شَادَا نَ وَخُشْدَا نَ یَا رَ رَا بَخْتِ شُدِ دَم "Cheerful and happy I carried my friend home with me;" زُزْدِ سَوَارِ آوَر "ZYDE came on horseback;" رَوْدِ تَشِشِ گَرِیزَا نَ وَاقْتَا نَ وَخِیزَا نَ "They saw him escaping and limping along;" &c. &c.

I CONCEIVE therefore that the *حال* denotes in the Persian Language, the presence at a given period of time, (namely, at the time of the occurrence of a certain event signified by the verb with which it is connected) of a certain attribute in the ذُو الْحَال; or that substantive noun to which the *حال* may happen to be applicable. And this restriction, in point of time, will furnish the true and only criterion by which to determine the difference between the *حال* and the نَعْت or simple adjective noun; which denotes the *general* existence of a certain attribute, in a given substantive noun to which it is imputed, without any restriction as to the accident of time. To explain by examples. When we speak of "a gazing crowd," the word "gazing" is a simple adjective; or (which is the same thing) it is a participle used in the sense of an adjective noun; because it denotes gener-

rally, without restriction as to the accident of time, the existence in the crowd of a certain attribute, namely, "gazing," which is thought to be commonly applicable to all crowds. But if we affirm, on the other hand, that "The crowd advanced gazing," or "gazing on the melancholy object before them," the word "gazing" will then be the *حال*, and the act of gazing, as applicable to the crowd, will be restricted in its duration to that period of time which is occupied in the performance of the action signified by the verb *To advance*. The same difference of sense will be still more conspicuous in other examples; since it is certain that the most morose and ill tempered of men may be caught *laughing* or *mirthful* on a given occasion; though it would be very absurd to apply to such a character, the epithets of "a laughing or a mirthful man."

It follows from the preceding observations that epithets of a transitory nature, such as *riding* or *walking*, *merry* or *sad*, *bappy* or *miserable*, *on horseback* or *on foot*, &c. &c. will be most commonly employed in the formation of the *حال*; because we have seldom occasion to restrict those of a more permanent species, such as *wise*, *foolish*, *virtuous*, *vicious*, *learned*, *ignorant*, &c. to that period of time which is devoted to the performance of a single action. For if a man be *wise* now, there is a great probability that he will continue to be *wise* during the rest of his life; and if we substitute *God* instead of *MAN*, we know that he must continue to be *wise* for ever. But though we know the fact of his eternal wisdom, we may, nevertheless, assert in him the existence of that attribute with reference to the period of our own supplications; as *اَيُّ خُدَايَ مَا دَا نَا وَبَسْبَا* "O thou our God who art wise and penetrating!" and this is the fact which has induced the Persian Grammarians, whether accurately or otherwise, to declare the words *دَا نَا وَبَسْبَا* to constitute in this example the *حال*, to which the word *خُدَا* is the *رُوُو الْفَعْل* and not the *صِفَت* or adjective applicable to that noun. .

As

As a simple adjective is exclusively applicable to its proper object or substantive noun, so an adverb is exclusively applicable to the sense of the verb, or to any given attributive with which it may happen to be occasionally connected. For if we speak of *reading well*, or *dancing ill*, it is obvious that the adverbs *well* or *ill* illustrate nothing but the sense of the verbs *To read* or *To dance*; and so, also, if we speak of "a good man," or "a virtuous woman," the adjectives *good* or *virtuous* are exclusively applicable to the sense of the following substantive nouns. But we must connect a noun with a verb, or something equivalent to a verb, before it can assume the character of the **ذُو نَسَال** that is to say, before the **نَسَال** can be formed from it; for as the **نَسَال** denotes the existence, during a certain period of time, of a given attribute in the **ذُو نَسَال** or, to speak more accurately, as the **نَسَال** is often applicable to the **ذُو نَسَال**, not generally, but only on a certain specific occasion stated in the context; so it follows that there must be virtually or verbally something (generally a verb) in the context, from which we infer the occasion of its application.

To explain by example. If it be affirmed that "An army approached the frontiers," three (or more) questions will naturally arise from this proposition, of which the first relates to *the army alone*, as whether it was large or small, and this is answered by the adjective noun: "A large army approached the frontiers." The second relates to *the action alone*, as whether the approach was rapid or otherwise, and this is usually answered by the adverb: as "The army approached rapidly;" for it must be observed that the word *rapidly* does not, in this example, convey the smallest information with regard to the state of the approaching army, but merely with regard to the action itself. The third relates to the verb and the noun; that is to say, it relates to the *state* of the army, not generally, but on a certain specific occasion (the occasion of its approach to the frontiers) signified by the verb with which it is connected,

hected, and consequently must be answered by the **حال**, as
 "The army approached on horseback," or, to include all three in
 a single sentence, "A *large army rapidly* approached the frontiers,
mounted on horseback;" &c.

HAVING endeavoured to explain the nature of the **حال**,
 as contradistinguished from adverbs and adjective nouns, it re-
 mains to be remarked that every **نبت**, that is to say every at-
 tributive, whether it shall be naturally a substantive or an adjec-
 tive, or a participle active or passive, or the member of a sen-
 tence, or a perfect proposition, may be found occasionally to
 form the **حال**. For the **حال** is merely an adjective noun
 used in the way which I have endeavoured to explain, and what-
 ever is capable of assuming the attributive character in the struc-
 ture of a sentence, must be *therefore* capable of forming the **حال**.
 Now every attributive by its own nature, may be resolved into a
 substantive noun and a mark of connexion; as *gold, golden* or *of gold*;
lead, leaden or *of lead*; &c. and the substantive itself, is often found
 to assume the attributive character without the aid of a mark of
 connexion; as when we speak of *gold wire, silk thread*, and other
 examples of the same nature. It is easy to perceive, therefore,
 that the **حال** will be sometimes, by its own nature, an adjective
 or a participle, or the member of a sentence, or a perfect proposi-
 tion; and sometimes, a substantive noun used as an adjective,
 either with or without the aid of a mark of connexion.

I NOW proceed to detail the rules (not very important,) that
 regard the application of the **حال** to the purposes of speech.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE **حال** is not verbally distinguished from the **مفت** or
سكرة **توهميني**, otherwise than by the absence of the vowel **نبت**,
 which

which must be inserted after the **موصوف** or **منعوت** (that is to say, after a substantive followed by an adjective noun,) but not after the **ذوات** followed by the **حال**. Examples: **زید سوار آمد** "The horseman **ZYDE** came," " **ZYDE** came on horseback;" &c. It should be remarked, however, that the **منعوت** or **موصوف** is so intimately connected with the **نعت** or **صفت**, as not to admit, perhaps, of the intervention between them of any other word, not even of the termination **را**; whereas the **ذوات** is very often separated from the **حال** by means of the intervention of other words. Thus the word **سوار** must be the **حال** and not the **صفت** in the following examples: **زید آمد سوار** or **سوار آمد زید**; because the verb **آمد** would not otherwise intervene between the substantive and the adjective noun.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE natural order of speech requires that the **ذوات** shall precede the **حال**, whether with or without the intervention of other words. Examples: **زید گریان آمد** " **ZYDE** came weeping;" **زید نامه میخواند** " **ZYDE** read laughing, the letter of **BUKR**;" &c. But the order of speech is of little importance in the Persian Language, and the **ذوات** may, accordingly, be often observed to precede the **حال**. Examples: **دوان آمدش گله بانی بدویش** "A shepherd approached him running." Or it may often be observed to follow the verb, as **پس آمد باری برش تازیان خسروشان و جوشان و نعره زان** "He rushed forward to his assistance, raging and furious and uttering loud cries!" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THIS laxity of arrangement must be laid aside, if it shall tend

H h

to

to create obscurity in the structure of a sentence; for, in that case, the *حال* must follow directly the *ذو النال*. Example: *زید دوان عسرا ابرقت* "ZYDE running seized AMR;" *زید عسرا اخندان بخانه آورد* "ZYDE brought AMR home laughing;" &c. Or if the *ذو النال* shall not be expressed in the sentence, the *حال* must then assume its place. Example: *من گریان عسرا آوردم* for *گریبان عسرا آوردم* "Weeping I brought AMR;" &c. It must be obvious to the reader that the application of the *حال* to the *agent* or the *object* of a given verb, cannot be determined, in these examples, otherwise than by advert-
ing to the order of speech.

R U L E F O U R T H.

BUT if there shall be any doubt with regard to the application of the *حال* to the AGENT or the OBJECT of a given verb, the *حال* itself will often comprise a perfect sentence, in which a pronoun or something of that kind will occur, in order to determine the *ذو النال*.

EXAMPLE FROM JAUMEE.

آنی عسیم من کردم آنچه کردم و عقل من بامن نه بود و تو بکن آنچه
می کنی و عقل تو بانتست

"O MY uncle, I acted as I have done, (being out of my senses:) Do you act as you are doing, (being in possession of yours.)"

In order to mark the *مُشَلَّه حَالِه*, which occurs twice in this example, I have placed it, improperly, between parentheses.

RULE

R U L E F I F T H.

WHEN the **حال** shall comprise a perfect sentence, it must be connected with the **ذو النحل** by means of a **رابط** expressed or understood; and the **رابط** employed on this occasion, will generally be the particle **و** *and*.

E X A M P L E.

مَسْرُومِ دَاز و دِلْهَاقِ دَاغِ تَوْبِشِ رِکَر و زَبِیْنِ اَیْدَتِ خُسْرِ پِشِ

“ Do not believe, the hearts of men suffering under the calamities inflicted by you, that you will experience happiness on the last day.”

THE particle **و**, which is expressed in the preceding example, may, however, be often omitted; as well as the pronoun required occasionally, though not invariably, in order to establish the relation existing between the **حال** and the **ذو النحل**.

E X A M P L E.

دُغَايِ مَتِ کِی شَو و سُو دَمَشِد اَسِیرَانِ مَقْلُومِ دَر چَاهِ بَسِد

“ How can my prayers avail you! the victims to your tyranny being still in prison.”

R U L E S I X T H.

A PRONOUN may be often superseded by the substantive noun to which it refers; and this is termed in Grammar **ذکر مُقْتَضِی بِنَجَایِ مُقْتَضِر**. *The use of a noun instead of a pronoun.* The pronoun, which would be referable if expressed, to the word **اِسْتَوَانَ**, is superseded by the word **خَانِه** in the following example:

نَواجِه

خواهد ویریشد نقش رايدان است خانه آرزاي بخت ويران است

“ THE master is busy in adorning his house ; while the house itself is tumbling into ruin.”

It is scarcely necessary to observe that when the **حال** is composed of a perfect sentence, it will generally follow the **رُؤْيِ وَاقِعِ** to which, however, it is sometimes prefixed. Example : **رُؤْيِ بَرِّخَاكِ عَجْزِ مِي كُتُومِ** “ My face bent down to the dust of humility and dependence, I say ; ” &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It sometimes happens that a second **حال** is formed from the first, when each of them happens to be a perfect sentence ; and the second, in this case, is termed the **حالِ مُدَاخِلِ** ; as opposed to the first, which is the **حالِ مُتَنَافِ**. I believe this form of construction is more congenial to Arabic than it is to Persian idiom ; in which, however, it sometimes occurs.

E X A M P L E.

زود با شد که خیره سر بيني بدو با آفت ده آند ريشد
دست بر دشت ميسزند که در بخت نشيند م حبيب و ايشمند
سعدی

“ You will soon see the disciple of folly bound in chains, and wringing his hands with regret for having refused to listen to the counsels of the wife.”

In this example, the second line forms the **حالِ مُتَنَافِ** and

and the third line forms the *حال* مُدْخِل to *خبره سر*, which is the *ذو النال*. The sentence indeed might be otherwise construed, but the following arrangement of the words will shew that it admits, also, of this construction.

زود باشد که خبره سر را پیشی حالی که هر دو پا گرفتار باشد دست
بر دست زمان از سر و درینج که سخن ناصح را بگوشت نیاد دوم

CONCLUSION.

I AM not certain that the reader will accord, in opinion, with all the doctrines that I have advanced on the nature of the *حال*, or that he will think the subject sufficiently important to justify the length into which it has led me. I suppress, therefore, many remarks of no great consequence that might yet be offered on that subject; and shall conclude with an explanation of the principal which seems to determine the accuracy of the application of the term *حال* to a perfect sentence, connected with another by means of the intervention of a copulative conjunction.

OF two propositions connected together by means of a conjunction, the one has not necessarily any sort of dependence on the other; for if we affirm that "JAMES arrived and JOHN departed," these are two distinct propositions, and there is nothing in the sentence by which it can be determined, that the departure of JOHN has any thing to do with the arrival of JAMES. But the *حال* has a necessary dependence on the *ذو النال*, to which it forms an attributive, even when composed of a perfect sentence; as the reader will easily perceive, by adverting to the example already adduced in the fifth rule: *نمیدار و دیها بد اخ نورش الی آخره*. In this example there is but *one* assertion, namely, that the person

addressed must not expect future happiness, the reason of this being assigned in the **بِمَسْئَلَةِ حَالٍ**, "The hearts of men suffering under the calamities inflicted by thee." That the **بِمَسْئَلَةِ حَالٍ** forms an attributive applicable to the **ذُو الْفَسَالِ**, must be sufficiently obvious; first, because the sense of the sentence might be thus rendered: "You! under *whose* tyranny the hearts of men are suffering calamity, do not believe that you will enjoy happiness at the last day;" and, secondly, because every body knows that a sentence comprising a relative pronoun, forms an attributive to the antecedent noun.

Those adjectives, formed from the imperative of a Persian verb by adding **ان**, as **دُائِمَانِ وَخَيْرِ ان** &c. have obtained, in Grammar, the appellation of the **حَال**, because they generally denote attributes of a transitory nature, which are most commonly employed in that capacity. There is no doubt however, if the observations contained in the present section of this chapter are founded in truth, that any thing *may* be the **حَال** which is capable of assuming the attributive character, though it may, by its own nature, be a noun substantive or adjective, a compound epithet, the member of a sentence, or a perfect proposition.

I now proceed to consider the nature of the **مُتَّبِعِ**, another grammatical term to which there is nothing analogous in English Grammar.

SECTION SECOND.

تَمْيِيز

OR

NOUN OF DISCRIMINATION.

THE word تَمْيِيز signifies literally *Separation or Discrimination*; and, in its grammatical acceptation, is THE NAME OF A GIVEN SUBSTANTIVE NOUN EMPLOYED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISPELLING AN OBSCURITY INHERENT IN THE SENSE OF ANOTHER WORD TO WHICH IT IS IMPUTED. If we speak of "A good man," for example, the word GOOD is not the تَمْيِيز, because it dispels an obscurity relating to the *attributes* of the man; but not, personally, to the idea signified by the word MAN, in which there is no obscurity of any kind. But if we speak of TEN MEN; TWENTY WOMEN; A POUND OF LEAD; A RING OF GOLD; AN OUNCE OF SILVER; A YARD OF CLOTH; A MEASURE OF CORN; &c. the second substantive, in each example, will be generally considered, (whether accurately or not,) as the تَمْيِيز or NOUN OF DISCRIMINATION, employed for the purpose of dispelling an obscurity every where inherent in the sense of the first *

By the word "obscurity," as it is now used, I do not mean to affirm that the first noun can be understood only in conjunction with the second; for, on the contrary, the word TEN for example, is clearly the substantive name of a number, as the word RING or CIRCLE is the name of a certain figure familiar to the eye; and so far, both are perfectly intelligible without reference to any other word. But the sense of the word RING is common to

* The first noun is known in Grammar by the term تَمْيِيز as opposed to the second which is the تَمْيِيز

every

every substance, without exception, that may happen to possess a circular figure; and the word TEN is applicable to a certain number of units, in what shape soever those units may exist. We cannot, a priori, tell the substance of which a ring is made; and if we speak of TEN, we must be generally unintelligible, unless the numeral shall be followed by a substantive noun.

THIS therefore is the obscurity, inherent in the sense of the first noun, which is to be dispelled by means of the second; and the natural intimacy of their connexion together, will supercede, in certain cases, the necessity or even the liberty of employing a verbal connective in order to establish that connexion. To explain by an example. Neither the use of the *إِضَافَةُ*, nor of any other particle, will be necessary or even admissible, in order to establish the relation existing between the *تَمْبِيرُ* and the *مُسَبَّرُ عَنْهُ* if the latter shall be the substantive name of a number, as *دَهْ أَتَبْ* "Ten horses;" or the name of a measure of length or quantity, as *دَوَكْرَهْ پَارَهْ* "Two yards of cloth;" *چهار صَدْرَمَنْ مَصْرِي* "Four hundred maunds of sugar;" &c. But if the *مُسَبَّرُ عَنْهُ* shall be the name of something, made or composed of the substance signified by the *تَمْبِيرُ* or *following substantive noun*, the connexion between them will then be established, either by means of the *إِضَافَةُ*, or the preposition *از*. Example: *دو خاتم از زر دارم* or, (which is the same thing) *دو خاتم زر دارم* "I have two gold rings;" &c.

The *تَمْبِيرُ* is sometimes formed from a perfect sentence, as when we affirm that "Zydz is bad;" (*زید بد است*) in which case, it may be reasonably asked in what respect he is bad? whether in regard to the form of his person, or the disposition of his mind; &c. &c. The answer to this question will form the *تَمْبِيرُ*, employed for the purpose of dispelling

elling an obscurity inherent in the sense of the word بد or *bad*, as applicable to ZYDZ: as زید بد است از روی شکل "ZYDZ is bad (or ugly) in his personal appearance." It should be observed, however, that this mode of construction seems to have been seldom or never used by the writers of Ancient Persia; having crept into the language in modern times, in consequence of the habit, common to many translators, of sacrificing the purity of their native tongue to the genius of the Language from which they translate. The words زید بد شکل است accord much better with Persian idiom, than زید بد است از روی شکل; a form of construction which must be considered as bearing the obvious marks of a literal translation from the Arabic Tongue.

CERTAIN Arabic nouns in the objective case, are commonly supposed to form the *تمییز*: such as قَصْرًا وِجْبًا وِیَفِیْقَةً; and many other examples of the same nature. These nouns (usually translated by English adverbs) have been long naturalised in the Persian Language; and the Persians, unmindful that the use of the objective case renders them independent of any adjunct, have sometimes (though rarely and certainly with little propriety,) added to that case the preposition به: as عَمْدًا بِهَ for نَهْمًا بِهَ, in the following example from the Poet HAFIZ: گویا نام ما ز یاد به عَمْدًا بِهَ می بری: "Why do you purposely cast my name from your memory," &c.

IT is in my power to offer some rules for the use and application of the *تمییز* to the purposes of speech; but those rules are very trifling; and the reader, if he knew them, would applaud that exercise of judgment which has led me to spare him the trouble of their perusal.

SECTION THIRD.

تَاكِيد

OR

CORROBORATION.

THE word تَاكِيد signifies *To strengthen, corroborate, confirm, &c.* and, in its Grammatical acceptation, is the name of any one or more words, that may happen to be repeated for the purpose of corroborating a given sense already once expressed in the sentence. If we affirm for example that "ZYDE came," (زَيْد آمد), it is possible that the hearer may suspect us of a lapsus linguæ: he may suppose that we have erroneously substituted the name of ZYDE, for that of AMR; or the verb رَفْتُ, for the verb رَفْتُ. In order to convince him that we have not committed any such blunder, it is usual, in every Language, to repeat the proposition in whole or in part; as زَيْد آمد زَيْد, or زَيْد آمد زَيْد آمد in which case, the repetition constitutes the تَاكِيد as already explained.

OR if it be affirmed that "The students of the College arrived," (شَاگِرْدَانِ مَدْرَسَةِ رَسِيدَنْد) it will yet be often matter of doubt, whether the term *students* shall be intended to embrace every individual among them without any exception; or whether the proposition, though generally true, shall yet be liable to some exceptions. The introduction of the term تَمَّ (شَاگِرْدَانِ مَدْرَسَةِ هَمَّ رَسِيدَنْد) or any other word of the same nature, will render the noun to which it is imputed, unquestionably applicable, without exception, to *all* the individuals of a given species; and this also (when the term هَمَّ follows the noun, but not otherwise,) is considered by Grammarians as a species of the تَاكِيد. THE

THE **تَاكِيدُ لَفْظِي** therefore is of two kinds : *first*, the **تَاكِيدُ لَفْظِي** or **VERBAL CORROBORATION**, which includes the repetition of words ; as **اَيْنَ قَوْمِ اَيْنَ قَوْمِ بِدَوْرِ اَيْنَ قَوْمِ** "This tribe, this tribe, may no evil befall this tribe !" or the use of synonymes ; as **اَدُمُ مَنْ** *I came* ; in which (accordingly to the general opinion of Grammarians) there are two pronominal nominatives to the verb ; namely, the word **مَنْ**, and the letter **م**, which is the conjunctive pronoun of **اَدُمُ**. With regard to **اَوْرَا نَقْتَسِ** *He said to him*, a mode of expression which is of no uncommon occurrence among the writers of Ancient Persia, it is most probable that there is no **تَاكِيد** ; the letter **ش** being a mere pleonasm, as well in this example, as in many others.

THE second class is the **تَاكِيدُ مَعْنَوِي**, or **SENSIFLUOUS CORROBORATION** ; which is so termed because the corroboration, in this case, flows from the sense. If it be affirmed, for example, that "The nations of Europe are *all* of them more civilized than those of any other region of the Globe," the word *all* will be said to corroborate the sense of the word *nations*, (or of any other word to which it may happen to be occasionally subjoined,) though these words are not at all synonymous in the ideas which they are intended to express. But if the word *all* were taken away, the sense of the sentence would be still perfect ; and the insertion of that word serves only to corroborate or confirm the accuracy of the general proposition, by shewing that it is open to no exceptions. On this principle the word *all* is here supposed to form a species of the **تَاكِيد** ; but if that word shall take precedence of the word *nations*, "All the nations of Europe," it will no longer form a species of the **تَاكِيد** ; because the insertion of the word *nations* is indispensably necessary, in that case, in order to dispel an obscurity inherent in the sense of the word *all*.

UNDER

UNDER the second class of the **تاکید**, are included many Arabic and Persian words nearly synonymous; such as **خود** *Verily or Self*; **هر یک** or **هر یکی** *Every one*; **همه** or **همگی**; **همه** or **همگی** *All*; &c. as **قوم فرنگ همه باقره** "The people of Europe are *all* intelligent;" **و تمام جنگ آور** "and *all* brave;" **و جمیع جالاک** "and *all* warlike;" **و کلی بی باک** "and *all* fearless;" **و تمامی صابِر رزم** "and *all* resolute;" **و تمامی خد او بند حُرُم** "and *all* military;" &c. &c. It should be observed that the word **خود** never requires the plural number, even when it follows a plural substantive noun, as **ما قسَمَن خود گفتند** "The wife *themselves* have said;" &c.

THE **تاکید**, in either class, is common to the Persian and to every other Language; and as I have no rules of importance to offer on the subject of its application to the purposes of speech, I shall here put an end to the present section.

SECTION FOURTH.

بَدَل

OR

EXCHANGE OF ONE WORD FOR ANOTHER.

THE subject of a given proposition may be variously expressed; as for example by a proper name, "ZYDE is virtuous;" or by a generic noun, "Your BROTHER is virtuous;" when ZYDE happens to the BROTHER of the party addressed. But the use of both will be often necessary; "Your BROTHER ZYDE is virtuous," in order

order to define, with sufficient accuracy, the person of whom we have occasion to speak : *first*, because a man may have more brothers than ZYDE ; and *secondly*, because, having one brother, he may have many acquaintances of that name. In either case, the word ZYDE and the word BROTHER must be combined, in order to obviate, in the mind of the hearer, every possibility of misapprehension.

OF two nouns so used, the first is termed the مُبَدَّلٌ or “The word for which something else is exchanged ;” and the second the بَدَلٌ or “Word exchanged for something else.” And the order of speech determines entirely the character of each ; since ZYDE which is the بَدَلٌ when it follows the word BROTHER, will become the مُبَدَّلٌ when followed by that noun ; or vice versa.

I HAVE already stated that both nouns will be often necessary in order to define with precision, the individual of whom we have occasion to speak ; and consequently *both* must be held in remembrance by the hearer. The Arabian Grammarians appear to disregard this fact, in the opinion which they have stated that “The predicate of a given proposition is exclusively applicable to the second or بَدَلٌ, and never to the first or مُبَدَّلٌ.” Thus VIRTUE, they say, is ascribed to ZYDE, not to your BROTHER, when we affirm that “Your brother ZYDE is virtuous ;” and to your BROTHER, not to ZYDE, if the transposition of the words (ZYDE your BROTHER) shall convert ZYDE into the مُبَدَّلٌ. The مُبَدَّلٌ is therefore considered by them as a member of the sentence, not indeed wholly superfluous, but introduced merely as a preliminary ; in order to prepare and fix the attention of the hearer, on the بَدَلٌ by which it may happen to be followed.

THE *بدل* of the Arabians has been divided into four classes; *first*, the *بدل* *البدل*, in which both nouns are descriptive of the same individual; as *جاءني زيد اخوتك* "Your brother ZYDE came to me;" *secondly*, the *بدل* *البدل*, in which the *بدل* forms a *part only* of the *مبتدأ*; as *فربت زيدا راسه* "I beat ZYDE, his head;" or, according to English idiom, "I beat the head of ZYDE;" *thirdly*, the *بدل* *البدل*, in which some, no matter what relation, different from either of the preceding, must exist between the *بدل* and the *مبتدأ*; as *سلبت زيدا ثوبه* "ZYDE his clothes were seized;" or "The clothes of ZYDE were seized;" and finally the *بدل* *البدل*, in which the *بدل* corrects the error of the *مبتدأ* uttered merely by a *lapsus linguae*; as *جاءني زيد جعفر* "ZYDE no JAAFUR came to me."

IN the Persian Language, the *بدل* follows the *مبتدأ* without the intervention of the vowel *نوعه* *نوعه* or of any other connecting particle; as *زيد براور موديت است* or *برادر موديت زید است* "Your brother ZYDE is virtuous;" &c. The *بدل* in the second and third classes is invariably expressed, either by means of the *واضافه*, or of the termination *ی*, which often supplies the place of the *واضافه* as *پای بکر شکستم* or *دست زید را گرفتم* "I broke the legs of BUKR;" or *زيد را دست گرفتم* "I took the hand of ZYDE." In translations from the Language of Arabia, Persian idiom is, however, not unfrequently violated by such expressions as the following: *زيد دستش را گرفتم* "I took the hand of ZYDE;" &c. a form of construction which cannot, I believe, be supported by the authority of any classical writer. The *بدل* *البدل* is necessarily common to every

easy tongue; and fellows, in Persian, the words **بَل** or **بَلْکِه**, or any other word of the same nature; as **زید ابن عمر** or **زید آورده** "ZYDE no AMR approached," &c. &c.

THE **عطف التبعان** of the Arabs is only a species of the **تبع** from which it need not be distinguished in this work; as **عبد الله ابن عباس** "ABDOOLLAH the son of ABBAS," **أسد الله الغاب** "The conquering lion of God, ALEE the son of ABOO TALIB;" &c. In these examples, the words **عطف التبعان** and **عبد الله ابن عباس** are termed the **عطف التبعان** inserted for the purpose of defining the nouns to which they are respectively subjoined. It would be a waste of time to offer any farther observations on the application of the **بَدَل** to the purpose of speech.

CHAPTER NINTH.

اصناف

OR

THE RELATION OF THE GENETIVE CASE.

It is well known that the number of cases applicable to the declension of nouns, differs essentially in various tongues. The Romans employed six cases; the Arabs have only three; and the Persians have but one case, namely the Genetive, in which the mark of annexation is given to the first or governing noun.

The vowel **شَرَه** is the mark of annexation most commonly employed to indicate the relation of the genetive case; as **بسر زید** "The son of ZYDE;" but, in certain cases to be detailed hereafter, that vowel point must be changed into **تَشَرَه**, as **دانی زید** "The slave of ZYDE," or into **دانی زید** "The

"The knower of secrets," an epithet often applied to the DEITY: The sound of the three written characters, thus employed to represent the اِضَا فِت, is that of اِضَا فِت or the soft Humza, represented in English by an accented é; as in the proper name of ALEX, the Goddess of Revenge.

IN reading a Persian manuscript, the utterance of the اِضَا فِت is indispensably necessary; and the omission of the sound which conveys it to the ear, would be an error of equal magnitude with the omission, in English, of the prepositions *of, to, from, than, in, with, by, for, at, among*, and many other words, and members of a sentence, by which the relation of the اِضَا فِت is often translated into our tongue. If the اِضَا فِت shall be represented by the letter ي, that letter must be inserted in Persian manuscripts, as in the example اِي رَا ز, already adduced. Or, if it shall happen to be represented by the letter ه, that letter also will be often, though not by any means invariably, written above the line; as اِضَا فِت ه. "The slave of ZYDE." But the vowel اِضَا فِت, which is by far the most common mark of the اِضَا فِت, seldom appears in written composition; because, though it might be accurately and generally inserted, the usage of the Language has determined otherwise.

THE great importance of the اِضَا فِت is founded, therefore, on a double basis; *first*, on the extent (almost incredible) of its application to Persian composition; and *secondly*, on the omission, in writing, of the vowel اِضَا فِت, by which it ought to be distinguished in manuscript to the eye of the reader, as it must be in utterance to the ear of the hearer. The ordinary omission of the mark of the اِضَا فِت is undoubtedly a great defect in Persian writing; insomuch, that I am not certain whether it has not been the cause of more obscurity, than would result, in the event of its insertion, from the omission of all the Persian prepositions. And hence

hence we may infer the necessity of acquiring an intimate knowledge of the nature and use of this particle, of which the explanation in theory is simple and easy.

In the Arabic Language, there is a state in which nouns exist before they are put into any case; as when an Arab, in reckoning the number of persons before him, pronounces their names: *عَسْرَ، بَكْرَ، &c. &c.* curtailed of the terminations that indicate case. When the noun is put into the nominative, objective, or relative cases, the three vowel points (whether accompanied or not by the mark *تَنْوِين*) will then be given to the last letter; as *الرَّجُلُ، الرِّجْلُ، الرِّجْلُ، زَيْدٌ، زَيْدًا، زَيْدِ* and thus the *nominative*, as well as the *oblique* cases, is distinguished in that Language by a termination peculiar to itself, which is superadded to the form of the radical noun.

THESE terminations are undoubtedly marks of annexation; employed in order to determine the grammatical character which a noun may happen to assume in the structure of a sentence: and as a noun in the nominative case must be the subject or the predicate of a given proposition, and cannot generally be any thing else, so, it may be accurately inferred, in all probability, that the relation signified by the nominative case is truly specific in every Language. If it be affirmed, for example, that "ZYDE beateth;" (*زَيْدٌ يَقْرُبُ*) or that "ZYDE is beaten;" (*زَيْدٌ يَقْرُبُ*) the Grammatical relation of ZYDE, to the predicate of the proposition, is exactly the same in either case: (that is to say, the relation of *زَيْدٌ* to *يَقْرُبُ* in the one case, is of the same nature with that of *زَيْدٌ* to *يَقْرُبُ* in the other case,) and so, also, if it be affirmed that "ZYDE stood;" (*زَيْدٌ قَامَ*) or that "ZYDE is generous;" (*زَيْدٌ كَرِيمٌ*) this Grammatical relation, allowing for the difference of the predicates in point of sense, will be still the same. And hence it may be inferred, as already stated,

M m m

that

that the nominative is employed, in every Language, to denote that *specific*, and therefore *unchangeable* relation, that exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition.

THE relation signified by the objective case is not, among the Arabs, equally specific; because that case is employed by them for other purposes, (خَاتَمِ قِصَّةٍ " A ring of silver," &c.) besides the great purpose of marking the object of a transitive verb. It is unnecessary here to enquire into the nature of the various relations expressed among the Arabs, by the objective case; and I shall therefore proceed to investigate the nature of the اِمَّاوَات, or that relation which is expressed in the Persian, as in every other Tongue, by the Genetive case.

THE preposition *of*, which marks the Genetive in our Language, is often employed to connect a noun with a verb; as when we say of an author, that " he treats well *of* a given subject," or any other example of the same nature. The Persian اِمَّاوَات is, on the contrary, wholly incapable of establishing any possible relation between a noun and a verb; and is never employed, but for the purpose of connecting together two nouns significant of different objects; as خَاتَمِ قِصَّةٍ *A ring of Silver*, زُرِّ كِسْفِ *A purse of Gold*, &c. &c. Among the number of nouns, in the present sense of the term *noun*, we must, however, include those English prepositions which are considered as nouns of the class termed نَطْرُوف by the Persian Grammarians; because they require, invariably, the sign of the اِمَّاوَات; as اِلَاوَى آسْمَانِ *Above (of) the heavens*; زِبْرُ زَمِيْنِ *Under (of) the earth*; اِيْشِيسْ قَاوِصِ *Before (of) the judge*; اِيْشِيسْ خَاوِصِ *Echind (of) the house*; اِيْشِيسْ اِيْشِيسْ *Amidst (of) the soldiers*; اِيْشِيسْ or اِيْشِيسْ or اِيْشِيسْ *Near (of) me*; اِيْشِيسْ *with (or literally a fellow traveller of) me*; and perhaps one or two more, which

do

do not, at present, occur to my recollection. The word بر, when it signifies ON, does not, any more than the other prepositions of the Persian Language, admit the اِفْضَالَت as بر آتش سوار شدم "I mounted a horse," بآباد دوچار شدم "I met my friend," &c. &c.

THE vowel كُسْرَه, when employed to mark the اِفْضَالَت, is termed كُسْرَه اِضَائِي or *The relative Kufra*, and is to be distinguished from the term كُسْرَه تَوْصِيفِي or *The attributive Kufra*, which is the same mark, employed to establish the connexion between a given substantive and the following attributive of any kind; as مرد عاقل *A wise man*; زن با آتش *An intelligent woman*; &c. The nature of the vowel كُسْرَه تَوْصِيفِي will be the subject of discussion in the following Chapter, and need not therefore employ our attention for the present. Of two nouns connected together by the relation of the genitive case, the first or governing noun is termed the مُضَاف, as opposed to the second, which is the مُضَاف إِلَيْهِ. The nature of the relation existing between them is accurately defined by the term اِفْضَالَت, which signifies literally RELATION IN GENERAL. And the term GENETIVE might be advantageously exchanged for the more appropriate designation of the GENERAL CASE; because this case does indeed denote, in every Language, the existence of *some relation or other* between two nouns significant of different objects, but never *defines* in any Language, the nature of the relation expressed by itself.

It would be easy to establish the accuracy of this proposition by many examples of common occurrence in every tongue; but I shall borrow one example from the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA*, of a nature so indisputable, as, in my opinion, to place the question beyond the utmost reach of controversial discussion.

"If

" If an expression be used, in which are connected together,
 " by the genitive case, two words significant of objects be-
 " tween which a *twofold relation* may subsist, it will be
 " found impossible, from the expression, to determine *which*
 " of these two relations is the true one; which must be
 " gathered from the context alone. Thus, for example, from the
 " phrase *injuria regis*, no man can know whether the injury men-
 " tioned be an injury *suffered*, or an injury *inflicted* by the king;
 " but if the genitive case notified any particular relation, (that is to
 " say, if the genitive case notified any one specific relation as op-
 " posed to another,) it is not possible that any such ambiguity
 " could exist; and hence it may be inferred that the genitive case
 " does indeed give notice, that two objects are *somehow or other*
 " connected together, but never *defines* the nature of the relation
 " that may exist between them." ENC. BR. ART. GRAMMAR.

So also in the Persian Language, the words *خدمت پسران*
 will generally signify " Service offered or given to religious in-
 structors" (by their devoted flock;) and *خدمت مریدان* will be sig-
 nificant of " Service performed by disciples" (to the person whom
 they have chosen as their religious guide.) In short the agent
 and the object of the transitive verb *خدمت*, (namely, those who
serve and those who *are served*) are here indifferently connected
 with the infinitive mode of that verb by means of the relation
 of the genitive case; and it is obviously the knowledge, *and that*
alone, which we entertain of the meaning of the terms *پسران*
 and *مریدان*, by which we are enabled to determine, with tolerable
 certainty, the nature of these two opposite relations. Whether
خدمت پسران ought to be rendered services *given* or *received*
 by religious instructors, the genitive case will never determine;
 but we know that such instructors are more commonly in the
 habit of *receiving* than of *yielding* the marks of submission, and
 on that principle we determine the question. It would be easy

to adduce many other examples of the same nature; as

فِدْوِيَّتِ اَيْنِ غَانَسَرِ "The devotion of this humble dependent;"

فِدْوِيَّتِ خِدْرُو نَرْبِ اَقْسَرِ "Devotion to the Sun enthroned King;"

&c. It may be inferred therefore, with certain accuracy, that the relation signified by the genitive case is not less indefinite in the Persian Language, than it has been found to be in every other-tongue*.

BUT as the genitive case does not define the nature of the relation expressed by itself, so it must be obvious that this case will be *therefore* applicable to the establishment of any one specific relation as well as of another; that is to say, it is not possible to conceive a given specific relation, existing between two nouns significant of different objects, that may not, in theory at least, be accurately expressed by the genitive case. This follows plainly from the nature of the term GENERAL RELATION, under which is included every *specific* relation that can be imagined. And if we extend through various tongues our enquiries into the nature of the genitive case, I am persuaded that theory and practice will be found to agree; for if we select a given specific relation existing between two nouns significant of different objects, that cannot, in a given Language, be accurately expressed by the genitive case, it is more than probable that *the very same relation* will be accurately and commonly expressed by that case in some other tongue. This at least I have found to be generally true, on comparing the various and opposite relations, respectively signified by the genitive case, in the English, Arabic and Persian tongues.

* The name of every event of the transitive class, has naturally a *twofold* relation: *first*, to the AGENT, and *secondly* to the OBJECT of the transitive verb which is derived from it. The word LOVE, for example, may be connected, by means of the relation of the genitive case, with the AGENT or the OBJECT of the verb TO LOVE: and if we speak simply of the love of an individual, it is impossible to determine whether we mean "The love which *another* bears to him," or "The love which *he* bears to *another*." The conclusion of the sentence will commonly determine the question. "The love of JAMES *for* his mistress," "The love of JAMES *by* his mistress," and "JAMES's love of his mistress," are equally accurate, though the word LOVE is here connected, by means of the relation of the genitive case, *first*, with JAMES who is the AGENT of the verb; *secondly*, with JAMES who is the OBJECT of the verb; and, *finally* with JAMES and HIS MISTRESS, of whom the one is the AGENT, and the other the OBJECT of the verb TO LOVE.

In Persian, for example, the nouns **نشیند، تخت** "Sitting on a throne," are accurately connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case; whereas the use of that case, in the example before us, is commonly superseded in English by the preposition **ON**. It would be awkward at least, if not erroneous, to substitute **OF** for **ON** in this example; or, in other words, to speak of a king as a man "sitting of a throne;" though that form of construction is perfectly accurate according to the idiom of the Persian Tongue. And so, also, the Arabic combination **سُنَّ اَوَّجَه** "Beautiful in the face," cannot be idiomatically translated into English, by means of the relation of the genitive case; although the two nouns **سُنَّ** and **وَجْه**, are accurately and generally connected among the Arabs by that relation.

ADMITTING therefore the extensive powers of the Genitive case, which cannot in theory be reasonably denied, it does not follow that the *practical application of that case* will, in any one Language, be co-extensive with its theoretical powers. The genitive case does not define the nature of the relation expressed by itself, and must therefore be theoretically applicable, with equal accuracy, to every specific relation that can be imagined to exist between two nouns significant of different objects; but as these relations are exceedingly numerous, perhaps innumerable, it would be inconvenient, in any one Language, to express them all by the same symbol; and hence it happens that other symbols have been every where invented, such as the prepositions *to, from, in, at, by, for, &c. &c.* by which we are enabled, whenever the necessity occurs, to define, at least in a certain degree, the nature of the relation which we desire to express.

THE use of these and other prepositions, which are often employed, in every Language, to connect together two nouns significant of different objects, tends to restrict, within the bounds of moderation, the practical application of the genitive case; but the restrictions thus imposed are not regulated

gulated by any common principle, and hence it happens that they will be found to vary according to the idiom of every tongue. I say, therefore, that there is perhaps no possible specific relation between two nouns significant of different objects, that may not be accurately expressed, in some Language or other, by having recourse to the GENETIVE or GENERAL CASE; but there are many specific relations that cannot be so expressed in a given Language, because the purposes of perspicuity will require, in every Language, the existence of certain *definitive* prepositions by which we may be enabled, whenever it is necessary, to define, at least in a certain degree, the nature of the relation which we desire to express.

It is probable, however, that most of the prepositions of every Language may be considered as *indefinite* in a certain degree; since many are capable of expressing more than one individual specific relation, and some (such as the word *for*) are undoubtedly capable of expressing many. But of all the prepositions in our Language, the word *or* is the most indefinite; and hence it happens that this word alone is practically employed to denote a greater number of specific relations, than can be represented, perhaps, by the united powers of every English preposition besides itself.

BUT however extensive the application of the genetive case in our Language may appear to be, it is much less generally employed than the relation of the *مِفَادَة* in the Persian Tongue. And as the symbols are commonly omitted, by which that relation ought to be distinguished in manuscript to the eye of the reader, as it must be in utterance to the ear of the hearer, it is scarcely possible to impress too strongly on the learner's mind, the necessity of acquiring an intimate knowledge of the nature and application of those symbols.

FOR this purpose he must depend chiefly on his own observation, and on the oral instruction to be acquired from his teacher; for if
it

it be true, as I have endeavoured to prove; that the genitive case is theoretically capable of expressing every possible specific relation that can be imagined to exist between two nouns significant of different objects, and that it is practically employed, in every Language, to express *an unlimited number of such relations*, it must be obvious that no classification that can be adopted, will be so perfect as to comprehend them all. On the contrary, the very nature and essence of the relation signified by the genitive case implies a repugnance to submit to the restraint of such classifications; for if it could be truly said of that case, that it denotes a certain number of specific relations, and that there are others which it cannot possibly denote, it would cease from that moment to be the **GENERAL CASE**.

I PROPOSE therefore, in the subsequent part of this chapter, not so much to specify the nature of *all* the relations which the genitive case is found to denote, as to confirm the accuracy of the preceding observations, by demonstrating the aptitude of the genitive case to denote a greater variety of specific relations than can be comprised in any Grammatical treatise whatever.

THERE are five Persian words, *namely*, *برای*, *چون*, *بر*, *در*, *از*. one or other of which is supposed to be capable of expressing, in every example that can be adduced, the nature of the relation of the genitive case: as *تخت از عاج* or *تختِ عاج* "A throne of ivory;" *خوابنده در شب* or *خوابنده شب* "A sleeper in the night;" *افتد بر خاک* or *افتد ده خاک* "Fallen on the earth;" *رنگم چون طبل* or *طبلِ رانم* "The drum of the belly;" *اسب برای زبند* or *اسبِ زبند* "The horse of ZYDE," &c.

THE first has been termed the *إضافتِ برای* because the *إضافة* denotes, in all the examples of this class, the thing or substance of which the *مضاف* is made; as *دیوارِ خشت* "A

“ A wall of bricks,” انگشتری زر “ A ring of gold ;” &c. The second has been termed *إِضَافَةٌ بِمَعْنَى*, because the Arabic word *بِ* has the same signification with the Persian *دُر* as *دُفَافِنِ زَمِينِ* “ Men or things buried in the earth ;” *نَمَازِ مَسْجِدِ* “ Prayers performed in a mosque ;” &c. No grammatical term has been invented for the *Izafut* in the third class, (*نَاسِئَةُ تَحْتَ* “ Sitting on a throne,”) which may indeed be referred to the second : but the fourth has been termed *إِضَافَةٌ تَشْبِیْهِ* or *The relation of similitude*, because, in every example of this class, the *مُضَافٌ إِلَیْهِ* is compared to the *مُضَافٌ* as *وَايَةُ أَبْرٍ* or *أَبْرٌ جُودِ* *The nurse of the clouds*, or *The clouds which resemble a nurse* ; a beautiful metaphor, employed to depict the influence of the clouds in cherishing the infant herbs of the spring.

THE term *إِضَافَةٌ إِلَیْهِ* has been adopted to express the relation of the fifth class ; because the letter *م* is an Arabic particle, synonymous with the Persian *برای* FOR. The relation signified by this class seems to be that of APPROPRIATION ; but the term APPROPRIATION is very general, and therefore embraces an unlimited number of specific relations having nothing in common with each other. If we reverse (where they can be reversed) the examples of the first, second, third, and fourth classes, they will instantly fall into the fifth class ; which may be considered, to use a Persian phrase, as a mere *کُتَّابِ بَغْضَوَل* “ A beggar’s dish ;” in which are promiscuously collected together the most heterogeneous materials that can be imagined. Examples : *تَحْتَ مَاجِ* “ A throne of ivory ;” *مَاجِ تَحْتَ* “ The ivory of a throne ;” *نَمَازِ مَسْجِدِ* “ Prayers performed in a temple ;” *مَسْجِدِ نَمَازِ* “ A temple dedicated to the purpose of prayer ;”

“ *ثَبَلُ بَيْطِ* ” The drum of the belly ; “ *بَيْطُ ثَبَلٍ* ” The belly or interior part of a drum ; &c. &c. In having recourse to this FIFTH CLASS of the *Izafut*, which merits not in fact the name of a class, Grammarians have virtually acknowledged the futility of their endeavours to effect that which will never be well accomplished in my opinion ; *namely*, the restriction, by grammatical arrangement, of those numerous, nay innumerable relations, that are continually expressed by the genitive case.

THE relation of APPROPRIATION includes that of the Infinitive or *Hasilé Musder* to the *agent* of the verb which is derived from it, whether transitive or neuter ; as “ *نَظَمَ زَيْدٌ* ” The sleeping of ZYDE ; “ *سَتَنَ زَيْدٌ قَتْلَانِ رَا* ” The slaying by ZYDE of such a person.” Of the infinitive to the *object* of a transitive verb ; as “ *رَا نَدَنَ دَرْ دِشِشِ اَزْ تَوْنِي زَيْدُ* ” It does not become you to drive away the poor.” Of the *agent* to the *object* of a given verb, as “ *كُتِبَ زَيْدٌ* ” The slayer of ZYDE ; “ *دَانَايِ رَا ز* ” The knower of secrets. Of the *object* to the *agent* of a given verb ; as “ *بُشْتِ زَيْدٌ* ” Slain by ZYDE ; “ *رَا نَدَةُ خُدَا* ” Rejected of God.” Of the infinitive and all the participles to the *Zurf*, as well as to *most other nouns* with which the action of the verb is any how connected ; as “ *بَر خَاشْتَنِ سَحَر* ” Rising in the morning ; “ *وَاخِلِ كَلْكَةِ* ” Arriving in Calcutta ; “ *رَا نَدَةُ دَرْ كَاهِ كَبَرِيَا* ” Driven from the court or favor of God.” And (among the Arabs not the Persians) of simple adjectives and participles of all kinds, governing by the relation of the genitive case, that noun to which an imputed attribute may happen to be applicable : as “ *حَسَنُ الْوَجْهِ* ” Beautiful in the face ; “ *صَادِقُ الْقَوْلِ* ” Truthful in words ; “ *مُعْزُو الْعَاقِبَتِ* ” Praised in his end ; &c. &c. &c.*

AMONG

* The *اسم تفضيل* in the comparative degree, is sometimes, though rarely, connected with the following substantive noun, by means of the relation of the genitive case.

Example :

AMONG common substantive nouns, the relation of APPROPRIATION includes that of *property*; as اسب زید "The horse of ZYDE;" of *application*; as زین اسب "The saddle of a horse;" of *nomenclature*; as روز دوشنبه "The day called Monday;" علم طب "The science of medicine;" of *creation, or authorship*; as سرای عالم "The LORD of the world;" شفا ی بوفلی "The Shefa written by ABOO ALEE SYNA;" of a *part to the whole*; as برگ درخت "The leaves of a tree;" ساعت روز "An hour of the day;" of a *receptacle to the thing which is contained in it*: as گوزه آب "A pitcher of water;" کیسه زر "A purse of gold;" of *propinquity by the relations of blood and marriage*: as پدر زید "The father of ZYDE;" شوهر هند "The husband of HIND;" and of the words هر and آن to that noun by which they are followed, as it is believed, in the genitive case: as هرکس "Every man;" همه مردم "All men;" &c. &c. &c.

THE relation of APPROPRIATION is every where obvious in these examples, and in a multitude of others that might be adduced; but that relation cannot be accurately expressed on every occasion, by having recourse to the preposition برای For. The examples علم که برای طب است, اسب که برای زید است, found very awkwardly in the ear of hearer, and scarcely deserve the name of Persian; and the relation of APPROPRIATION will therefore form, in my judg-

Example: بدتر کنش خود "Meaner than one's self." In the superlative degree, it is generally connected by that relation. Example: بزرگترین مردمان "The greatest of men;" افضل الناس "The most excellent of men." &c.

* It is unnecessary to state to the reader, that a saddle does not belong to a horse, in the same sense, that a horse is said to belong to his master; and consequently, that the genitive case denotes *one* relation, when we speak of "The horse of ZYDE;" and *another*, when we speak of "The saddle of a horse."

ment,

ment, a better criterion by which to determine the examples of the *Izafut* in the fifth class, than can be obtained by having recourse to the preposition *برای* *For*. The relation of *APPROPRIATION* includes a multitude of specific relations, by far too numerous to be comprised in any Grammatical treatise whatever.

THE *إِضَافَت* has been divided, among the Arabs, into two classes ; of which the first is termed *إِضَافَت لِّلْفِعْلِ* as opposed to the second, which is the *إِضَافَت مَعْنَوِي*. The first class comprises every infinitive, or simple adjective, or participle active or passive, which is connected, by means of the relation of the genitive case, with what has been termed its own *مَقْتُول* ; that is to say, with a given substantive noun which would be the agent or object of the corresponding verb. To explain by examples. The verb *قَالَ* "He spoke," corresponds with its infinitive *قَوْل* "Speaking;" "He was beautiful," with the simple adjective *حَسَن* or *حَسِين* "Beautiful;" the active verb *قَتَلَ* "He slew," with the participle active *قَاتِل* "A slayer;" and the passive verb *قُتِلَ* "He was slain;" with the corresponding participle *مَقْتُول* "Slain." And hence it follows that the words *قَوْل زَيْد* "The speaking of ZYDE;" *حَسَنُ الْوَجْهِ* "Beautiful in the face;" *قَاتِلُ بُكَر* "The slayer of BUKR;" *مَقْتُولُ بُكَر* "The person slain by BUKR;" exhibit examples of the *إِضَافَت لِّلْفِعْلِ*; because the nouns which are here in the genitive case, would be the *agent* or *object* of the corresponding verbs. To this fact the native teachers mean to allude, in speaking of the *إِضَافَت مَصْدَرِي مَقْتُول* ; *إِضَافَت مَصْدَرِي مَعْنَوِي* *فَا عِلَال* and other expressions of the same nature, that are very commonly employed by them.

BUT it is not merely with the agent or object of the corresponding verb, that a given infinitive, or a participle active or passive, or an adjective noun, may be accurately connected by means

cf

of the relation of the genitive case. For on the contrary, the **نُزِف** will be very commonly found to assume that relation; as **نُزِفَ لَيْلٍ** "Sleeping *in* the night;" **نُزِفَ سُبْحٍ** or **نُزِفَ نَهْـدٍ** "Rising *in* the morning;" **نُزِفَ بَيْتٍ** "Sitting *in* the house;" **نُزِفَ جُزْءٍ** or **نُزِفَ جُزْءٍ** "Arriving *at* the knowledge of particulars;" or "Examining accurately the minutiae of affairs;" **نُزِفَ لَيْلٍ** or **نُزِفَ لَيْلٍ** "A person slaying, or slain *in* the night;" **نُزِفَ كَلْكَلَةٍ** or **نُزِفَ كَلْكَلَةٍ** "A person arriving, or having arrived *at* Calcutta;" &c. &c. And indeed it would be matter of considerable hazard, to assert of any given substantive noun which is any how connected with an active, a passive, or a neuter verb, either with or without the intervention of any preposition, that such noun cannot be accurately connected with the infinitive, the simple adjective, or the participles belonging to that verb, by means of the relation of the genitive case. I believe, however, that the **فَاعِلٌ**, the **مَفْعُولٌ**, and the **نُزِفٌ**, will be found, as already stated, to assume that relation much more generally than any other description of nouns with which the verb is anyhow connected.

If the **مُضَافٌ** shall not be an infinitive, or a simple adjective, or a participle active or passive, governing its own **مُتَمَوِّلٌ** in the genitive case, the relation will be that of the **إِضَافَةُ مَتَوَيٍّ**; as **أَبُ زَيْدٍ** "The father of ZYDE;" &c. And though the Arabian Grammarians have noticed what is considered by them as an essential inherent distinction between the nature of the **إِضَافَةُ لَفْظِيَّةٍ** and the **إِضَافَةُ مَعْنَوِيَّةٍ**, I shall pass over in silence the arguments employed on that question; first, because I am clearly of opinion that those arguments are founded in error; and, secondly, because there is not, in my judgment, any essential distinction between the nature of the relation expressed by the **Izafut** in either case.

I SHALL now proceed to detail the rules that relate to the application of the symbols employed to mark the relation of the genitive case.

RULE FIRST.

Of two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, the first or governing noun will generally receive the vowel **كُتَبَ**. Examples: **كِتَابُ زَيْدٍ** "The book of Zayd;" **مَدِينَةُ زَيْدٍ** "The cradle of the earth;" &c. This general rule is liable to certain exceptions which are to be detailed in the following rules.

RULE SECOND.

If the letter **ل** or **و** **Maaruf** or **Mujhool**, shall happen to occur at the end of the **مُفَاعِل** or governing noun, that noun will then receive the letter **لُ**, having the sound of **لُتَبَ** or the soft **Hamza**. Examples: **عَصَا** "A staff;" **عَصَايَ مُوسَى** "The rod of Moses;" **وَأَمَّا** "Wife;" **وَأَمَّا** "The knower of secrets;" **وَأَمَّا** "Seeds;" **وَأَمَّا** "The seeds of the grape;" **وَأَمَّا** or **وَأَمَّا** "A ringlet;" **وَأَمَّا** "The ringlets of my beloved;" **وَأَمَّا** "A ray;" **وَأَمَّا** "A ray of the sun;" &c. In every other case, the letter **و** receives, as usual, the vowel **كُتَبَ**. Examples: **مَدِينَةُ زَيْدٍ** "The bull of the earth;" (supposed to perform the office of **ATLAS**, by bearing on his back the weight of the Globe;) **نَافِثَةُ زَيْدٍ** "Look at the new moon of the festival of Lent;" &c. &c.

RULE THIRD.

A QUIESCENT **لُ** following the letter **لُ**, as **لُ** "The fact;" or the vowel **لُ**, as **لُ** "Wine;" or the letter **و** **Maaruf**

Maaroof or Mujhool, as رُوِي "The face," شُوِي "A husband," will itself represent the IZAFUR; and must receive, in utterance, the sound of قَبْرُهُ مُبِينٌ, or the soft Humza already mentioned. Examples: مَيَّانِگُوَر "The seat of thought," رُوِي دِلدار "The wine of the grape," رُوِي دِلدار "The face of my beloved," شُوِي هِنْد "The husband of Hind;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE letter يَائِي مَعْرُوف occurring at the end of a word, will receive, as usual, the vowel رُءُوسِي. Examples: رُءُوسِي صَبِيح "The light of the morning," رُءُوسِي زَبَد "The knowledge or wisdom of ZYDE;" &c. But this letter may be doubled in poetry, if the measure of the verse shall happen to require it. Example from Jaumee: يَائِي مَحْوِي مَن زِدِ شَقْتِ كَرِمْ اَرِنْدُو رُءُوسِي گَزْدَشْت "Although my intoxication, from the influence of your love, has passed all bounds;" &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

If the letter يَائِي مُخْتَفٍ shall happen to occur at the end of the مَضَاف, it will then be surmounted by the mark مَقْسَرُهُ مُدْبِقِيَّةٌ, which is written above the line, as مَقْسَرُهُ مُدْبِقِيَّةٌ "A slave, or servant of the king," رُءُوسِي بَارِجَاهُ "A person going to the palace;" &c. The letter يَائِي مُظْهَر or "The sensible Aspirate," when it happens to occur at the end of the مَضَاف, will receive as usual the vowel مَقْسَرُهُ. Example: مَقْسَرُهُ مُدْبِقِيَّةٌ "The King of the world;" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE last letter of every noun which is followed by a conjunctive pronoun of the singular number, whether in the genitive

rive or in any other case, will generally receive the vowel قَ

Examples : كِتَابُ " My book ; " ثَيْبُ " Thy horse ; " نَيْمُ " My wine ; " خَادِمُ " His servant ; " رُؤُوسُ " My foot ; " رُؤُوسُ " His face ; " شَوْبَةُ " Thy husband ; " جَانَةُ نَوْمٍ " My devotion ; " My new garment ; " &c. &c.

But if the مُضَاف Shall end in الف as عَصَا " A staff ; " or in واو Maaroor or Mujhool, as رُو and حُو for رُوحِي and رُوحِي ; the letter يَائِي مَقْشُوع must then be added : as عَصَائِم " My staff ; " حَوَائِثُ " Thy temper ; " رُؤُوسُ " His face ; " &c. Or if the مُضَاف shall end in مُخْتَفٍ يَائِي, it will receive in that case the letter زالف as جَانَةُ أَم " My garment ; " ثَيْبُ " Thy pen ; " خَادِمُ " His letter ; " &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

In poetry, when the measure of the verse shall happen to require it, nouns ending in the letter نون, or in الف, or in واو Maaroor or Mujhool, or in ل Maaroor, may be followed by a conjunctive pronoun of the singular number, without the intervention of any vowel point, or of any alphabetical letter whatever.

Examples : اِحْسَانِي يَائِي " Thy boundless beneficence ; " حُشَمِي بَيْنَات " My master ; " مَوْلَانِي " His eyelids ; " فَرْقَانِي " Thy seeing eyes ; " اَبْرُوِي " His odes ; " فَرْقَانِي " My eye-brows ; " بَسْمِيكِي حَوَات " Thy well disposed son ; " حُورِي سِيدِي " My joy ; " &c. &c. It is to be remarked, however, that the first personal pronoun cannot be added, without the intervention of a vowel point, to any noun ending in the letter نون ; because, in that case, it would be difficult or impossible to pronounce the words. Example : حُشَمِي مِي گُونَم never حُشَمِي مِي گُونَم " My wine coloured eyes ; " &c.

RULE

R U L E E I G H T H.

IF many nouns, connected together by the means of conjunctions, shall be rendered مُنْصَف to a single noun, the vowel كُشْرَه will be given to the last only of those nouns. Example: *پَاكَرُ وَبَسَدَه وَشَنَاخَوَانِ شَبَابِ اِنِمْ* "We are servants, and slaves, and eulogists of you." But if a succession of nouns in the genitive case shall happen to follow each other, the vowel كُشْرَه will then be given to every noun except the last.

E X A M P L E.

مَنْ خَاكِ كَفِ بَايِ سَايِ كُتُوِي كِسِي اَم
كُتُو خَاكِ كَفِ بَايِ سَايِ كُتُوِي تُو بَا شَد

R U L E N I N T H.

THE words *هر Every*, *همه All*, *بجز Besides*, and *چون Like*, seldom or never admit, in utterance or in writing, the mark of the Izafut; although they are commonly supposed to govern the following substantive nouns in the genitive case. Examples: *هر کس* "Every man;" *همه کس* "All men;" *یاوری بخیر خدا بیست* "There is no protector but God;" *آدم چون بکر* "A man resembling BUKR;" &c. In poetry, however, the word *همه* is sometimes followed by the mark of the Izafut. Example: *تا شد خبرم در همه شهر در آفتاب* "Until intelligence of my condition was spread over the city."

R U L E T E N T H.

IN poetry, when the measure of the verse shall happen to require it, the mark of the Izafut may be omitted in utterance, if the letter *هائي محقق* shall occur at the end of the governing noun. Example:

Q q q

نهر

جُونِ سُدا اُخواہد کہ پُر دہس دَر د مُبیل اُو وُر طَعْنۂ پانگان زبَر

"When God determines to bring disgrace on a man, he inspires him with an inclination to censure the virtuous." In this example, the measure of the verse requires *يَرُدُّهُ كَس*, not *يَرُدُّهُ كَسْ*; but the omission of the mark of the Iza'fat is more common in ancient, than in modern poetry.

RULE ELEVENTH.

IN poetry the mark of the Izafut is very commonly omitted, when the **مِفْعَالُ الْبِنَةِ** shall happen to be a conjunctive pronoun in the plural number. Examples: **عُمْرَانُ** for **عُمْرَانُ** "Your age;" **دِلِ شَانِ** for **دِلِ شَانِ** "Their hearts;" &c. The omission, in this case, of the mark of the Izafut, is more common in ancient than in modern poetry.

R U L E T W E L F T H.

THE mark of the Izafut is optionally and generally omitted after the word **سَر**, when compounded with certain other words; as **سَرْمُرُوْد**; **سَرخَبِل**; **سَرزَيْن**; **سَرچشمه**; **سَرانگت**; **سَرپنجه** &c. And after the word **صَاحِب** in certain cases; as **صَاحِبِ هَسَر**; **صَاحِبِ دُرُو**; **صَاحِبِ شَكُو**; **صَاحِبِ دِل**; **صَاحِبِ نَظَر** &c. And after the word **شَب** in one or two examples; as **شَبِ حُون** and **شَبِ بَرَات**. And in certain other compounded words, such as **نَمَسَرزَيْن**; **آشَبَاب**; **سَتَب** &c. &c.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

If one or more words shall happen to intervene between the مُضَاف and the مُضَافُ إِلَيْهِ, (an accident of no very common occurrence) the vowel **سُورَ** will then be commonly omitted.

omitted. Examples: *شمار است تو بت بر این خوان نشست* for *شمار است تو بت نشست است بر این خوان* "It is your turn to sit at this table;" &c.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

WHEN two nouns are borrowed from the Arabs, one of which governs the other in the genitive case, the first will generally, perhaps invariably, receive the vowel *مُتَّ*, and the second will follow the article *ال*. Examples: *مُتَّ الشَّيْءُ بِشَيْءٍ أَقْوَمَ*; *إِجْتِنَاعُ الْقَبْضَيْنِ عَسَائِمُ النَّبِيِّينَ*; &c. &c. The vowel point of the first noun depends among the Arabs on the case, whether nominative, relative, or objective, in which it may happen to occur.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

WHEN the *مُفَّ* shall precede the *مُفَّ*, an accident of very common occurrence in the Persian Language, the vowel *مُفَّ* must be omitted. Examples: *جَهَانُ شَاه* "The king of the world;" *عَالَمُ شَاه* "The asylum of the world;" &c. But both may be rendered *مُفَّ* to any other word; as *جَهَانُ شَاهِ مَا* &c. &c. The precedence of the *إِضَافَةُ* is distinguished in grammar by the terms *إِضَافَةُ مُقْبُوبَةٍ* or *إِضَافَةُ مُقْبُوبَةٍ*, "The reversed Izafut," and the examples of its occurrence are exceedingly numerous.

RULE SIXTEENTH.

THE termination *ر* is often found to supply the place of the Izafut; in which case, it must be added to the *مُفَّ*. Examples: *سَرَزَنْدَ* for *سَرَزَنْدَ رَ* "The head of ZYDE;" *بَشَرِ سَمَر* for *بَشَرِ سَمَرِ رَ* "The son of AMR;" *دُرِ اَيْنِ كَنْجَبَنَه* for *دُرِ اَيْنِ كَنْجَبَنَه رَ* "I was opening

opening the door of this treasury ;” &c. And in this case, one or more words may occur between the مُضَف and the مُضَفَّيْهِ, which last will be found invariably to precede the مُضَف. Example : عَسَدٌ وَزَايَةُ اِنْصَافٍ كَرُوْنٌ بِرَبْنَدٍ “ Bind the necks of your enemies by the practise of equity ;” &c.

CONCLUSION.

It has been hitherto taken for granted that the relation of the genitive case must be established between two nouns significant of different objects. The fact is generally true, but the use of the Izafut will be better understood by adverting to the effect produced on the مُضَف or GOVERNING NOUN. I hold it as a principle, to which there are no exceptions, that the first of two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case must be A GENERAL TERM, or A PROPER NAME considered with reference to the possibility of its application to a plurality of objects. The word JOHN, for example, is a proper name common to many individuals ; and therefore we speak of JOHN OF GAUNT, in order to distinguish *that* individual from others who are known by the name of JOHN. The word ENGLAND is also a proper name, applicable only to a single country ; and being therefore incapable of farther limitation, it will be seldom or never followed by a substantive noun in the genitive case. To a man who had never heard of England, we might indeed speak of European England, or “ the England of Europe ;” but in doing so, we must be influenced by a desire to limit the *possible* application of England, which might be the name of more countries than one.

THE effect of the اِضَافَةُ is therefore TO LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF A GENERAL TERM ; and the extent of such limitation will depend entirely on the nature of the مُضَفَّيْهِ. If the latter shall

shall happen to be a proper name, or a personal pronoun, the **مُفَسَّس** will be often restricted to a single object, or to a very few individual objects; as **بِرادر زید** "The brother of Zeyd," **روی تو** "Thy face," and other examples of the same nature. And if it shall happen to be a general term, the limitation will then be less extensive; but still it must exist in a certain degree, otherwise the **Izafut** will be of no use. If the words **روی انسان** "The face of man or woman-kind," are to be considered as accurate, it is only because the word **روی**, in its utmost latitude, is applicable to the face or physiognomy of other animals, as well as to that of the human species. For if the word **روی** were exclusively applied to the human face, it must be obvious that the term **انسان** would add nothing to the information conveyed by that word, and must be therefore considered as wholly superfluous.

THE words **سیاهی رنگ** "Blackness of color," might be accurately condemned on the same principle; because there is no blackness but that of color. But if we oppose ornamental colors to those which arise from dirt and filth, admitting that blackness may result from either, the words **سیاهی رنگ** will then be accurate, because the term **سیاهی** will be restricted so as to denote that blackness which is the result of ornamental colors, opposed to the blackness that results from filth. The accuracy of the terms **رنگ سیاهی** "The color of blackness," cannot be questioned; because the general sense of the term **رنگ** is clearly restricted by that of the following substantive noun.

If a word shall govern itself in the genitive case, a circumstance of no very uncommon occurrence in the Persian Language, as **خوب بینان** or **بینک بینک** "Good among the good," or "The best of the good," **بد بدان** or **بد بد** "Bad among the bad," or

R r r.

" The

"The worst of the bad," the same principle may yet be observed to operate; for GOODNESS in man is a relative term, and it is higher praise to be "GOOD among the GOOD," that is to say, "GOOD in comparison with virtuous men," than it is to be simply GOOD; that is to say, "GOOD with reference to the species in general." That the words GOOD, WISE, VIRTUOUS, &c. &c. are merely relative terms, must be obvious to those who consider that if all mankind were equally wise, or equally virtuous, the terms WISDOM and VIRTUE would be of no use. The following lines of the poet NEZAUME contain the words بِدْرُ "The worst of the bad," which the reader may perhaps be desirous to see.

زِ مَسْرِكَانِ رَوِي بَرِّ نَافِسَمِ سَكِسِ خَوِشْتَنِ خَوِشْتَنِ يَافِسَمِ
بَرِّ نَافِسْتَانِ گَرِ بَدْرُ بَدْرُ شَوَمِ هَانِ بِه كَرِ مَعْدُونِ خَوِشْتَنِ شَوَمِ

"I RELINQUISH entirely the practise of love. I have found that myself am the best friend to myself. If, among lovers, I shall therefore be deemed the worst of the bad, (I care not) for it is proper that I myself should be my own mistress."

CHAPTER TENTH.

صِفْتُ وَ مَوْصُوفُ

OR

SUBSTANTIVE NOUNS ACCOMPANIED BY ATTRIBUTIVES OF ANY KIND.

UNDER the term ATTRIBUTIVE, as it is now used, I mean to include every thing, without exception, that may accurately coalesce with a given substantive or other noun to which it is imputed. AN ATTRIBUTIVE, in this extended sense of the term, may

may be a substantive noun, as **مُرَوَّان** "Courageous men;" or a noun of number, as **رُوزِی دُو بَرین بَر آمد** "Two days passed after this;" or a simple adjective noun whether primitive or derivative, as **مُرَوِّیک** "A good man;" **مُرَوِّدَانَا** "A wise man;" or a participle of any kind, as **آبِ رَوَّان** "Running water;" **فَامَتِ سَرِشِدَه** "The shining sun;" **فَامَتِ سَرِشِدَه** "A lengthened stature;" **سَنَنِ مَعْقُول** "A just observation;" &c. or an epithet simple or compounded, as **مُرَوِّد بَاعِبَان** "A gardener;" **پادشاهِ نَحْتِ نَشِین** "A heart ravishing mistress;" **شاهِ پَرِوَلِ رُبا** "A king sitting on a throne;" **مُلْکَتِ رُوزِ افزُون** "An empire encreasing daily;" **وَرَحَتِ خُود رُو** "A self growing or unplanted tree;" **زَاہِرِ شَبِ خِیَمَر** "A night watching devotee;" **وِ کَاوَرَانِ جَنگِ آز مُوَدَه** "A man versed in affairs;" **مُرَوِّکَا رَوِّدَه** "Experienced warriors;" **مُحَبِّوبِ نَجْمَتِ شَمَائِل** "A happy tempered mistress;" **پادشاهِ بی دَاوَدِگَر** "A rosy faced damsel;" **یَاہِرِ مَحَلِ رُو** "A tyrannical prince;" **پادشاهِ بی دَاوَدِگَر** or **مُلْکِ مَحَبِّوبِ گَر فَتَنَه** "A country conquered in war;" **نَفْسِ لَبِ دَرِ آبِ قُرَاتِ حُشَمِ آسَنَا** "A thirsty person swimming in the water of the river of his eyes;" **مُصِیْبَتِ زَوْکَانِ خَساکِ کُودَرَتِ وَغْبَارِ جَرْمَانِ بَرَسَرِ افشان** "The unfortunate who throw on their heads the dust of grief and disappointment;" &c. &c. The reader will easily perceive, that I include under the term COMPOUND EPITHET, those members of a sentence, such as **خَساکِ کُودَرَتِ وَغْبَارِ جَرْمَانِ بَرَسَرِ افشان**, that may be accurately ascribed to a given substantive noun or an epithet, (as **مُصِیْبَتِ زَوْکَانِ**) by means of the intervention of the vowel **تَوَصِیفِی** or **سُکْرَه** "The attributive Kufra."

ALL attributives are divided into those which are PROPER, (**مِصْبِتِ اَمَلِی** or **مِصْبِتِ عَامِ**) because they are truly attributive.

by

by their own nature; and into those which are IMPROPER, (مِفْتَ عَابَرِي or مِفْتَ ضَام) because they are not naturally attributive, but only assume occasionally the attributive character in the structure of a sentence; as مَرِي شِير "A man bold as a lion;" مَرِي خَل رُو "A rasy-faced mistress;" &c. For I have already observed on a former occasion, that the words مَرِي and رُو are merely two substantive nouns, having no grammatical character at all, but such as they acquire when ascribed to a given substantive noun with which they may happen to coalesce in the structure of a sentence.

THE PROPER ATTRIBUTIVES of the Persian Language comprise, *first*, the اِسْم فَاعِل or PARTICIPLE ACTIVE; *secondly*, the اِسْم مَفْعُول or PARTICIPLE PASSIVE; *thirdly*, the اِسْم سَائِل formed from the imperative by adding ان; as دُرُوان, بَرُگَرِيان, &c. *fourthly*, the صِفَت or SIMPLE ADJECTIVE NOUN whether primitive or derivative; and *finally*, the اِسْم تَفْظِيل or NOUN OF SUPERIORITY, employed to indicate the relation of the comparative and superlative degrees. IMPROPER ATTRIBUTIVES of every kind may be distinguished, for the sake of convenience, by the term نَسَبَت, which is properly applicable, without exception, to all attributives of either class. The noun to which a نَسَبَت or نَسَبَت, may happen to be imputed, is indifferently termed مَوْصُوف or مَوْصُوفَت. The اِسْم تَفْظِيل will be the subject of discussion in the following chapter, and this chapter will comprise all the observations I am able to offer on the nature and application of other attributives.

THE reader has already learnt the existing rules applicable to the formation of simple adjectives and participles of every kind. Compound epithets are formed by ANALOGY, according to the pleasure of every writer; and the rules that relate to the manner of their formation are too numerous to be comprised in any grammatical

metrical treatise whatever. There is no necessary limit to the number of words that may enter into the formation of a compound epithet; and perhaps it is generally true, that any intelligible sentence may be converted at pleasure into a compound epithet, attributed to a given substantive noun or pronoun by means of the intervention of the vowel **و** **سُورَه** as **مِنْ بَرُونَتِ بِسَادِ آنِ مُسْتَرَبَّانِ مَنِ بَاشَمِ** **وَسُورَه** "I am continually thinking of you my friend;" **مِنْ بَرُونَتِ بِسَادِ آنِ مُسْتَرَبَّانِ** "I who am continually thinking of you my friend," &c.

Now as we cannot number those infinitely various combinations that may occur in the formation of a perfect sentence, so it is also impossible to number those combinations, infinitely various, that may occur in the formation of a compound epithet. And as we do not seek to support, by the authority of prescription, the legitimacy of a perfect sentence unexceptionably accurate in the mode of its formation, so we have no occasion to support, by the authority of prescription, the legitimacy of a compound epithet unexceptionably accurate in the mode of its formation. To explain by examples. The following sentence is supported by the authority of SAADEE: **بَادِشَاهِی رَا شَنِیدِم کَرَبَتَنِ آبِیْرِ اِشَارَتِ فَرَمُو** "I have heard of a king who gave orders to put a certain prisoner to death." But the authority of SAADEE is here superfluous, because the accuracy of the sentence would be still unquestionable, though it were now uttered for the first time. And so also in the words **نَفْسِ لَبِ دُرَّ آبِ فُرَاتِ بِشَمِ آشَا** "A thirsty person swimming in the water of the river of his eyes;" the epithet **فُرَاتِ بِشَمِ آشَا** might be supported by the authority of an eminent author from whose writings it has been extracted by me. But such authority is wholly unnecessary to establish the accuracy of that epithet, sufficiently supported by the analogous formation of other epithets, and by the privilege vested in every writer, by the compound-loving genius of the Persian Language, to invent and employ for the first time, as many new combinations of this nature, as the fertility of his fancy may enable him to discover.

Compound epithets have been usually considered as merely ornamental, and therefore better adapted to the language of poetry than of plain prose. If the fact were true, it would be dangerous to assume the privilege of inventing compound epithets; *first*, because it is never necessary to aim at the higher decorations of style; and *secondly*, because every unsuccessful endeavour of that nature is justly punished by the reader's contempt. But though I do not mean to deny that Persian poetry is pre-eminently indebted, for the splendor of its diction, to the happy selection (and often to the invention) of compound epithets bearing the stamp of poetical fancy and taste, it does not therefore follow that such epithets are peculiar to poetry, or to the elevated language of rhetorical prose. On the contrary they are of constant occurrence in every species of Persian composition; and are so natural to the genius of the Language, that it would be very difficult, perhaps impossible, to write a page of intelligible Persian without having frequent recourse to their aid. They are accordingly found to express, not merely the fanciful imagery of poetic diction, but the common conceptions of ordinary life; as *مرد تجارت پیشه*, "A merchant;" *ملک به جنگ گرفته*, "A country conquered in war;" &c. And they occur in prose (more especially in the prose of modern times) with a profusion generally unknown to poetry, which impairs or annihilates all pretensions to purity or even perspicuity of style.

I do not therefore recommend the invention of compound epithets, already by far too numerous in the Persian Language, except in cases of urgent necessity; but as it will frequently happen that a writer, without the aid of these, will be wholly unable to express his thoughts; so it is also true that he may, nay, that he must, in that case, have recourse to the *invention* of compound epithets; not with a view to the ornaments of style, but merely by the effect of a necessary compliance with the idiom and genius of the Persian Language. Such epithets, though unsupported

supported individually by the authority of prescription, will yet be unexceptionably accurate if the inventor can shew, by analogy, the existence of other similar combinations; and it would be nearly as absurd in the case of a compound epithet as of a perfect sentence, to limit, by the authority of prescription, the privilege vested in every Persian writer of forming new combinations for himself.

THE following are many of the rules applicable to the formation of compound epithets; and I have already stated the impossibility of devising any classification, so perfect as to comprehend them all.

R U L E F I R S T.

AN epithet may be formed at pleasure, of any *particle* prefixed to a substantive or an adjective noun. Examples : مُسَا فِرِی نَوَا "An unprovided traveller;" مَرَوِ بَا مَال "A wealthy man;" وَ زَبَرِی نَدِ سَبِیْر "A helpless man;" زَنِ لَ عَا قِل "A foolish woman;" مَالِ وَ زَرِ دَسْت "Money in hand;" دَا رَا یِ یِ مَدَا رَا "The relentless DARIUS;" فَرِیْدُو نِ بَا آن شُكُوْه "Füredoon with all his dignity;" &c. &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

AN adjective accompanied by a substantive noun may be formed into a compound epithet, applicable (like the word GREY BEARD in our Language,) to any object in which the imputed attribute may happen to exist. Examples : شَا عِرِ ثَوَشِ کَلَام "An eloquent poet;" مَاشِقِ شَدَلَب "A thirsty lover;" مَشَوَقِ مَوَزُو نِ اَدَا "A mistress of pleasing or graceful manners or appearance;" قَلَمِ زَبَانِ شُكُوْه "Merchandize of high price;" مَالِ گِرَانِ قِیَمَت "A broken pointed pen;" &c. &c. In all the examples of this class,

class, the arrangement of the epithet may be optionally reversed, as *مَشْكُونٌ سَيِّئٌ بِشِيرِينَ* or *مَشْكُونٌ بِشِيرِينَ سَيِّئٌ* &c. &c. and it is a matter of indifference whether the attributive part of the epithet shall be a simple adjective, or a participle active or passive, Arabic or Persian.

R U L E T H I R D.

AN epithet may be composed of a substantive or other noun prefixed (but never subjoined) to the form of the imperative in the second person singular; which will then most commonly assume the sense of the active, but not unfrequently of the passive participle. Examples *يَا دُشْمَانُ كَفُورٌ شَيْ* "A conquering prince;" *شَرِبَتْ كَلَابٌ آمِيزٌ* "A draft mixed with rosewater;" &c. &c. The first component part of the epithet may, in this class, be the NOMINATIVE or AGENT to the corresponding verb; as *(جَايِيْكُمْ مَشْكُونٌ خَيْرٌ)* "A place abounding in musk;" or, *secondly*, the ACCUSATIVE or OBJECT; as *خَامَةٌ كُوْهُرٌ بِرِيْزٌ* "A pearl sprinkling pen;" or, *thirdly*, the ظرف or NOUN OF TIME OR PLACE; as *يَا سَبَّانُ شَبْ كُرْدٌ* "A watchman going his rounds in the night;" *كُوْهُرٌ خَامَةٌ خَيْرٌ* "A gem springing up or born in the family;" or, *fourthly*, an adjective used ADVERBially; as *اَسْبَبَنْزَرُوْ* "A swift going horse;" or, *finally*, a substantive noun, any how connected with the corresponding verb, whether with or without the intervention of any preposition; as *تَوْبٌ اَسْبَرُوْ* "Horse artillery," or "Artillery moving by the means of horses;" &c. &c. &c. The second component part of the epithet, possessing the form of the imperative in the second person singular, must have the sense of the active or passive participle; as *شَا مِرْ كُوْهُرٌ بَار* "A poet raining pearls;" *(بَارِئَةٌ كُوْهُرٌ)* "Observations mixed with friendship;" &c.

If the form of the imperative shall happen to have the sense of the **HASILE MUSDER**, as **مَاشِشِ كُوشِ** for **مَكُوشِ نَالِ** “Rubbing the ears,” or “Punishment;” it will form no epithet, but merely a compounded substantive noun, employed to denote the name of an event.

R U L E F O U R T H.

An epithet may be composed of a substantive noun prefixed (but never subjoined) to the form of the verb in the third person singular of the preterite tense. In this case, the second component part of the epithet will have the sense of the past or passive participle. Examples: **مَلِكٌ حُدَا دَاو** “A country given by God;” **بَشْمِ حَوَابِ اَلْوَد** “Eyes overpowered with sleep;” &c. &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

An epithet may be formed of an adjective, connected with its proper substantive noun by means of the relation of the genitive case. Examples: **خَزَلٍ مَرْمِ اَلْسَدِ** “An incomparable ode;” **مَرْدٍ صَادِقِ اَلْقَوْلِ** “A man truthful in words;” **اَوَّلِ سَابِ اَيِّ نَمُودِ اَلْعَابِقَةِ** “The saints praised in their ends;” **فَقِيرٍ وَاجِبِ اَلتَّعْزِيرِ** “A devotee worthy of respect;” &c. All the epithets of this class are borrowed from the Arabs; and there is not, I believe, any instance of a Persian adjective connected with its proper substantive noun by means of the relation of the genitive case.

R U L E S I X T H.

An epithet may be formed of two substantive nouns, one or both of which may be Arabic or Persian. Any two substantive nouns that may be accurately connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, will form an epithet of this

T : t

class.

class, whenever the مُضَافُ shall precede the مُضَافُ;
 as دُرِّ بَانُوَال "The bounty of the river;" بُنَوَالِ دُرِّ بَا
 "Bountiful as the river;" &c. Examples : مُصْبِرٌ مَحَبَّتِ نَجْمِ "A
 mind mixed or leavened with friendship;" پَادشَاهِ كُدَرِ قُدْرَتِ "A
 king powerful as fate;" جَنَابِ ثَقَبَاتِ اِثْنَابِ "A
 threshold related to excellence;" خَسانَهٗ نَجْمَتِ شَمَانِهٗ "A pen
 perfumed with friendship;" پَادشَاهِ مُعْتَرَاَتِ كِبَاشِ "A just
 prince;" آسْتَنَانِ وَلَايَتِ آسْتَبَانِ "A holy threshold;"
 خَايِلِرِ نَوَدُودِ مُظْهَرِ "A mind the source of friendship;"
 جَنَابِ مُعَالِي مَنَابِ "A threshold the asylum of noble actions;"
 پَادشَاهِ جِسْمِ جِشَاهِ "A king in rank equal to JUM;"
 يَارِ كُلِّ عِذَارِ "A hand bountiful as the river;" دَسْتِ دُرِّ بَانُوَالِ
 "A rosy faced mistress;" يَارِ سَمَنِ بَرِّ "A mistress having
 a breast fragrant as jessamine;" &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

An epithet may be formed of two Arabic nouns, the first being
 an infinitive, or a Hasile Musder, connected with an adjective
 or passive participle, by means of the relation of the genitive
 case. Examples : زَبَانِ فَيْضِ رُبَّحَانِ "A tongue the inter-
 preter of bounty;" قَلَمِ مَرْتَمَتِ تَوَامِ "A pen twin-born with
 mercy or kindness;" مَوْضُوعُونَ خَلَّتِ مَشْعُونِ "Observations re-
 plete with friendship;" &c.

R U L E E I G H T H.

An epithet may be formed, like a perfect sentence, in any
 possible way that is not repugnant to the rules of Grammar.
 The endless variety of combination exhibited in the forma-
 tion of such epithets, must continue for ever to elude the utmost
 limits of Grammatical research. Examples ; مَرَدُ خَسانَهٗ بَرَدُ دَشِشِ "A

"A

“ A traveller;” or “ A man who carries his house on his shoulders;”
 حَكِيمٌ مَرَّ بَانَ آفَرِینِ “ The ALLWISE BEING who bestowed
 on the tongue the faculty of speech;”

“ A moon, or beautiful woman deserving the crown of royalty;”

“ عاشقِ خارِ عَشاوَرِ پَارِ فَتَ رَاهِ دُشَوَارِ سَکَذِ اِرِ مَدَّ نَاسِیِ “ A
 lover who has received in his foot the thorn of affliction,
 caught in travelling over the labourful road of his pursuit;”

وَلِ سَمِّ فَرَقِ اَزِ سَیِّدَهٗ اَلَا مَالِ اِرَاوَتِ بَرِ بَرِ بَرِ سَرِ اَوَکُتِ سَکِیِ سَیِّدَهٗ رِ بَرِ سَیِّدَهٗ
 “ A wretch who has bowed his head to the ground
 of humility with prostrations full of affection for thee;”

عَاشِقِ فَرَقِ نَاقِصِ مِ وَبِشَاطِیِ گِوِ دَیْدَهٗ بَیْهَادِیِ سَیِّدَهٗ نَبَا زِ پَاشِیِ پَرِ دَاجِیِ
 “ A lover LOVER who, having converted his whole
 body into one universal forehead, is employed in performing
 the prostrations of dependence on thee;”

وَاوَهٗ نَظَرِ اِنْ بِشَمِ اَزِ خَاصِدَانِ دَامِ گِرِ فَتَ دَرِ سَرِ اِپَا یِ خِوِ بِشَمِ رِ گِرِ
 “ The noble minded who, borrowing the eyes of envious men,
 inspect with vigilance their own imperfections;”

بِشَمِ گِشْتَهٗ رَوِ بَانَ مُتَبَرِّیِ خِوِ اَزِ سَیِّدَهٗ نَکَرِ اِنْ بَعَارِ بَیْتِ خِوِ اَشْتَهٗ

بَا عَالِمِیِ بِطَرِیقِیِ مُتَلَمَّحِ وَا تَوَدُّ دَرِ اِهٖ جَدَلِ گَامِ زَنِ وِیِ سَبَرِ

“ The exalted characters who, having borrowed austerity of
 temper from the vicious, walk with others in the road of lenity,
 (or judge of others with lenity,) and pursue themselves the paths
 of severity;” that is to say, “ guard unremittingly their own con-
 duct;” &c. &c. &c.

* * * * *

UNDER one or other of the preceding rules, it is probable
 that most compound epithets of the Persian Language may be ac-
 curately and reasonably comprised; and though some of them,
 as the SIXTH RULE, might be subdivided into many classes, I am
 of opinion that no advantage would result from the multiplication

of

of such divisions. The principle of the rule is broad and comprehensive. It states that two substantive nouns, connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, may be easily converted into a compound epithet, simply by inverting the order of arrangement ; as *نَمِيسِرِ مُجْتِ* "The mixture of friendship ;" *نَمِيسِرِ نَمِيسِرِ مُجْتِ* "A mind of the mixture or leaven of friendship;" *مُجْتِ نَمِيسِرِ مُجْتِ* "A mind mixed or leavened with friendship," &c. And whether one or both of these nouns shall be Arabic or Persian, or to what class of Arabic or Persian nouns both or either may happen to belong, these are questions with which I have nothing to do ; *first*, because is it sufficient for me that both are substantive nouns ; and, *secondly*, because it will generally suffice for the accuracy of the epithet, that they shall form together an intelligible combination.

APPLICATION OF SYMBOLS.

THE symbols commonly employed to mark the relation of the genitive case, serve also to establish the relation of a given substantive noun to the following attributive which is imputed to it : as *مَرْدِ جَوْنِ شِیر* or *مَرْدِ شِیر* "A man bold as a lion ;" *حَصَايِ سَخْتِ* "A hard staff ;" *بِتْدِهٔ نَبِی* "A good servant ;" *خَوِیِ زِشْتِ* "A bad temper ;" &c.

THE vowel *سُ* is distinguished, in this case, by the term *سُ* *نَوَاصِفِی* or "The attributive Kufra ;" as opposed to *سُ* *اِضَافِی* or "The relative Kufra;" employed to mark the relation of the genitive case. It has been observed, however, by certain grammarians, that the letter *ی* *تَجْمُودِ* was anciently employed to distinguish the attributive relation from the relation expressed by the genitive case ; as *عَلَامِیِ مَاقِلِ* "An intelligent slave ;" opposed to *عَلَامِ مَاقِلِ* "The slave of a wise like

or intelligent man." But the words **عَلَامِ مَاتِل** unquestionably admit of either sense; and the introduction of the letter **يَايِ مَجْهُول** is comparatively speaking of rare occurrence, even among the writers of ancient Persia*. It is true, indeed, that the words **عَلَامِ مَاتِل** will signify invariably "An intelligent slave," and cannot possibly be otherwise translated; but if the letter **يَايِ مَجْهُول** were introduced for the purpose of dispelling the obscurity to which I have adverted, it would be quite impossible to assign any good reason for the frequency of its omission where it ought to be inserted. The letter **يَايِ مَجْهُول**, when so used, seems to me to have the force of an indefinite article; and like the word CERTAIN in our Language ("A person of my acquaintance," "A CERTAIN person of my acquaintance,") it may be omitted or inserted at pleasure.

ALTHOUGH the symbols employed to mark the attributive relation are generally the same with those employed to denote the relation of the genitive case, I think it necessary to detail the rules by which their application is guided and restricted in the Persian Language.

RULE FIRST.

THE vowel **تَوَصِيفِي** is commonly employed to mark the relation existing between a given substantive and the following attributive which is imputed to it. Examples: **مَرَدِ بَشِيرِ** or **مَرَدِ چُونِ بَشِيرِ** "A courageous man;" **پادشاهِ بی دَاو** "An unjust Prince;" **دَمِ بَشِيرِ مُجْتَبِی** "A mind leavened with friendship;" &c.

* The letter **يَايِ مَجْهُول** is often inserted, at this day, after nouns in the plural or singular number, followed by the relative pronoun **کِ**; **کِ سَنَبِ** "The persons who;" &c. and in this case, it seems still to denote the attributive relation; since every sentence, comprising a relative pronoun, may be considered as an attributive applicable to the antecedent noun.

R U L E S E C O N D.

If the letter الف quiescent, or واو Maarooif or Mujhool, shall happen to occur at the end of the مَوْصُوف, the vowel اَمْزَةٌ مُنْسَبَةٌ must be changed into با, having the sound of اَمْزَةٌ مُنْسَبَةٌ or the soft Humza. Examples: "An extensive plain;" مَحْشَرَايَ فَرَاخَ "A hard staff;" عَصَايَ سَخَتْ "Arch-ed eyebrows;" اَبْرُوِي مَقْوَسَ "Dishevelled hair;" مَوْتِي بِرَبْشَانِ &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

An original با occurring at the end of the مَوْصُوف, after the letter Alif, or the vowel Futba, or the letter Wao Maarooif or Mujhool, must be changed, in utterance, into اَمْزَةٌ مُنْسَبَةٌ, and will receive as usual the vowel Kufra. Examples: "A pure place;" جَايِي بَاك "Pure Wine;" رَوِي دُرُشَانِ "A shining countenance;" مَوْتِي غُلْطَانِ "A moving ball;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H

THE letter واو, following the vowel Futba at the end of the مَوْصُوف, must receive as usual the vowel Kufra; and will not be changed in utterance into اَمْزَةٌ مُنْسَبَةٌ. Example: اَسْرَايَ نَوَاَرَه "New and fresh seeds;" &c. The same rule is applicable to the letter واو مَعْرُوف when it happens to occur as a double letter at the end of the مَوْصُوف. Example: غَايِي نَاْمَدَه "Useless elevation;" &c. And to a single بَايِي مَعْرُوف in the same situation. Example: صَوْتِي صَانِي "A pure Soofce;" &c. But the letter بَايِي مَعْرُوف may be rendered مُشَدَّد in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it; as مَشْوِي مَوَلَوِي مَعْنَوِي "A pure Soofce;" "The (celebrated) Mufnovee of the spiritual Molovee."

RULE

R U L E F I F T H.

THE letter **أَي** مُتَّصِفٌ, occurring at the end of the **مَوْصُوفٌ**, must receive the mark **قَمَرَةٌ مُتَّصِفَةٌ** or the *soft Humza*. Examples: **أَنَا بَشَرٌ** "An intelligent slave;" **أَيُّ قَمَرَةٍ** "A celebrated letter;" &c. The omission of the sound of **قَمَرَةٌ مُتَّصِفَةٌ** is admissible in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it.

R U L E S I X T H.

WHEN two nouns, connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, shall happen to be followed by a given attributive, it will be often impossible, otherwise than by the context, to determine whether the attributive shall be applicable to the first or second of these nouns. Examples: **بَنَاتُ زَيْدٍ نَاقِصٌ** "The sons of the foolish minister;" or "The foolish sons of the minister." in which last sense the phrase has been employed by SAADÉ. But it is always desirable to avoid obscurity; and on that principle the attributive ought in my opinion to follow, without the intervention of any other word, the substantive noun to which it is imputed. Examples: **بَنَاتُ زَيْدٍ نَاقِصٌ** "The foolish sons of the minister;" **بَنَاتُ زَيْدٍ نَاقِصٌ** "The sons of the foolish minister." Often indeed, nothing can be more important than the arrangement of the words composing a sentence. "Sir, said a person, I will tell you honestly how much money I got." "Sir, replied his adversary, will you tell us how much you got honestly?"

R U L E S E V E N T H.

IF the **مَوْصُوفٌ** shall be followed by two or more attributives unconnected by the intervention of copulative conjunctions, every

every attributive, the last only excepted, will generally receive the vowel **كُفْرَه** **كُفْرَه** or "The relative Kufra." Example: **وَيَا بَارِعًا مَذَارِبُ شَرِّينَ مُنْعِنَ سَمَنَ بَدَنَ زِيَارَتِي سَبَبَهُ مَوِي** &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

BUT if we intend to enumerate, by successive attributives, the good or bad qualities for which the **مَوْصُوف** may happen to be remarkable, the vowel **كُفْرَه** will then be generally given to the **مَوْصُوف**, and omitted universally after every attributive. Example: **يَا بَارِعًا جَبِينُ مَهْدٍ أَرْكَبِي غَمَّاتٍ زَوَّادٍ** "A faithful mistress, brilliant as the moon, overflowing in love, the consoler of grief, &c." In this case the letter **يَا** may be given to the **مَوْصُوف**, and to every attributive by which it is followed. Example: **وَيَا بَارِيَّةَ جَبِينِ مَهْدٍ أَرْكَبِي غَمَّاتٍ زَوَّادِي** &c. Or it may be omitted, together with the vowel **كُفْرَه**, for the purpose of giving variety of sound to the measured prose in which the Persians are known to delight. Example: **شَاهِ دِينَ بِنَاهِ كَبِيرَانِ بَارَكَا، بَجَبِيدِ شَمَّ عَطَاهِ دَرْ قَمَّ قَلَكِ بَابِهِ مَحُورِ شِيدِ بَابِهِ قَبِيضِ بَرُورِ** &c. Of its omission in poetry, the following is one among many examples. **مَرَا بَارِيٍّ اسْتَسْلَبِينَ دِلِ سَبَبِ مَكْرِ** &c. **دَشْتِ پَهْلَانِي**

RULE NINTH.

If two or more attributives shall be connected together by means of the intervention of the copulative conjunction, the sound of the conjunction will be that of ZUMMA added to the letter which immediately precedes it. Example: **وَبَادَهُ مَعْلُ رُنْكَ وَتَلْخُ وَرَيْزُ وَخُوشِ خَوَارُ وَ سَبَبِ** &c. But though the introduction of the conjunction is here supported by the authority of HAFIZ, I think it better, on general principles, to employ the

the vowel **سُكْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي** in such cases, that so the **مَوْوُف** with all its attributives may form, as it were, a single noun significant of a certain specific object. And if the attributives shall happen to be employed, not as the **صِفَت**, but merely as the predicate of a given subject, the conjunction may then supply advantageously the place of the vowel **سُكْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي**.

EXAMPLE.

نَازِكٌ بَدَنٌ وَكَارِجٌ وَتَنَكُّيْنٌ دَلٌ
بَشِيرَتَيْنِ مَحْنٌ وَطَيِّفٌ وَبَسِيمَتَيْنِ سَاقٍ اَسْت

RULE TENTH.

If the **مَوْوُف** shall happen to precede the **صِفَت**, the vowel **سُكْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي** must then be omitted. Examples: "A good man," **وَادِعُزَّاتٌ** "Abundant joy," **فَرَاوَانِ نَفَاط** "A just king," **بَلِي هَائِيَانِ اَنْسِاط** "Endless delight," &c. But both may be followed by an adjective noun; in which case, they must be connected with such adjective by means of the vowel **سُكْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي**. Example: "A good man of an agreeable temper," **بَشِيرَتَيْنِ مَحْنٌ وَطَيِّفٌ** &c.

RULE ELEVENTH:

THE introduction of the letter **بَا ي مَجْهُول**, or of the substantive verb, or of the relative **كَر**, between a given substantive noun and the following attributive which is imputed to it, will necessarily supercede the use of the vowel **سُكْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي**. Examples: "A venerable man," **مَرْدِي هَائِلٌ** or **مَرْدَا اَسْت هَائِلٌ** "He is an ignorant man," **دَل كَر مَطَو مَارِد مَابُو** "My heart which was a volume of constancy," &c. But if the **صِفَت** shall be divided from the substantive noun to which it is imputed, by means

W w w

of

of the intervention of what has been termed the *صِفَة*, or its *مُتَبَعَات*, the vowel *كُسْرَه* *تَوْجِيفِي* must then be inserted. Examples: *دَلِ اَز دُنْيَا كَرِيزَان* "A heart flying from the world;" *مَرْدِ بَرَزَاوَرِ اَنَسْت رَوَنَدَه* "A man walking in the right road;" *دَلِ بَشَوِي نَاوَقَتِي مَا بِل* "A heart inclining to trifles;" *عَالِمِ فَرْقِ كُنُسَدَه نِهَكِ اَرَبَد* "A very weary mind;" *خَاطِرِ سَنَسْت مَانَر* "A learned man discriminating good from bad;" &c. For in these last examples, the *صِفَة* is considered as a compound epithet, the parts of which, taken together, form, as it were, a single attributive applicable to the *مَوْصُوف* with which it is connected. Perhaps the purport of this rule may be better expressed, as follows. The intervention of any one or more words connected with the *مَوْصُوف*, will prevent the application to the latter, of the vowel *كُسْرَه* *تَوْجِيفِي*, but if the intervening words shall belong to the *صِفَة*, the vowel *كُسْرَه* *تَوْجِيفِي* must be inserted.

R U L E T W E L F T H.

IT has been said, that the vowel *كُسْرَه* *تَوْجِيفِي* may be omitted after a substantive occurring between two adjective nouns; as in the following example from the poet KHOSRO. *بِهَبَّارَه خُسَرُو خُسَه رَا مَحُونِ بَرْتَجَنِ فَرْمُودَه اَنَسْت* "She has given orders to shed the blood of the poor and wretched KHOSRO." I know of no other example by which the accuracy of this rule can be supported, and this example is insufficient for the purpose. It may be scanned as follows: *مُسْتَفْعِلَانِ بِهَبَّارَه خُس*, and so on through the rest of the line. But the rules of prosody authorize the substitution of *مُفَاعِلَانِ* for *مُسْتَفْعِلَانِ* in any one of the *اَرْكَان*, or pillars of the verse; and thus the word *خُسَرُو* may receive the vowel *كُسْرَه*, or otherwise, according to the pleasure of every reader; as thus: *مُسْتَفْعِلَانِ دَرُو خُسَه رَا* or *خُسَه رَا*

مُفَاطِنَ رَوْحُهُ رَا. From which it follows, that the poet, in all probability, did not mean to authorise the omission of Kufra, after the word رَوْحُهُ. It is certain, at least, that the omission of that vowel point, in such cases, must be considered as a rare occurrence.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

THE vowel كَسْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي is generally omitted in the case of certain compounded words; such as مَرَقَايَ for مَرَقَايَ literally "A water fowl;" and now, in the course of time, become, as it were, the substantive name of all the wild birds of the web-footed species.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

OF the disjunctive pronouns, the word مَنْ may be followed by any given attributive, with which it must be connected by means of the intervention of the vowel كَسْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي. Example: يَا مَعْجَا بَا مَنْ دِيَوَانَهُ مَكْنُ كُفْتُ وَشَوُو: "O my admonisher, talk not with a madman such as I am!" مَرَقَايَلُ كَعْدَ عَرَبِيَّةٍ بَا مَرَدُومُ مَسْت "For a wife man will not wrangle with him that is drunk." After مَرَا, the vowel كَسْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي must be omitted. Example: كَرَمَرَا زَارَهُ كَشْتَن بَرُو آن يَارِ عَزِيزُ: "If my beloved mistress should carry me who am weak and helpless to be slaughtered." After ا and شَا the attributive must be put into the plural number. Examples: شَا زَرِيرُكَان "You, who are intelligent;" اَتَوَا اَرَان "We, who are rich;" &c. The vowel كَسْرَةُ تَوْصِيفِي must be omitted after the word تَوْ. Example: نِيچَا رَه كَر دِلِ شَوَا مَهْسَر مَان وَهَد: "The wretch who bestows his heart on thee unkind;" &c. The third personal pronoun is seldom or never followed by an attributive of any kind.

CONCLUSION.

CONCLUSION.

THE rules of concord by which, in many Languages, an adjective is made to agree with a substantive in gender, number and case, are unknown to the purity of the Persian Tongue ; *first*, because the accidents of case and gender are wholly inapplicable to Persian adjectives ; and, *secondly*, because it is a rule of the Language that the substantive must be omitted, whenever an adjective is put into the plural number. Examples : دلاوران or خوب رویان (مردان دلاوران never) " The brave ;" زنان خوب رویان (never) " The beautiful ;" &c. And for several ages after the introduction of Arabic words into the Persian Language, it does not appear that any regard was paid to the rules of concord, which are generally, and in my opinion properly, rejected even at this day. Examples : دوستان صادق " Faithful friends ;" تأنهای عجیب " Wonderful subtilties ;" مقاصد مضمین " Worldly or external objects ;" مطالب صوری " Spiritual, internal, or essential matters ;" &c.

In process of time some examples have nevertheless been borrowed from the Arabs, of the concordance, in point of number, between a given attributive and the substantive noun to which it is imputed ; as کلمات طیبات " Pleasant words ;" رفاہیم کریم " Generous letters ;" خواطر حواطر " Brilliant pearls ;" دربر غرر " Beneficent" or literally " Odoriferous minds ;" &c. These examples are by no means numerous, and they have been adopted, apparently, for the sake of the gingle in which the Persian are known to delight. It would be no breach of grammatical accuracy to put the adjective, in every example of this class, into the form of the masculine gender of the singular number, but the feminine gender will be often employed ; as کلمات طیبہ و رفاہیم کریمہ &c. &c. for the reasons now about to be detailed.

It is a rule of Arabic Grammar that an adjective singular, in the feminine gender, will generally agree with a substantive in the plural number, under any of its imperfect forms; as **اَوْصَافٌ تَمَسِّدَةٌ** "Praise worthy attributes;" and other examples of the same class. A substantive noun feminine by nature, or by means of the termination **نَائِبَةٌ**, requires also that the adjective should be put into the feminine gender; as **بَسْمَةٌ خَسَنَةٌ** "The handsome Hind;" **حِكْمَةٌ كَامِلَةٌ** "Perfect wisdom;" &c. &c.

NEITHER of these rules are of *necessary* observance in the Persian Language; and they are generally disregarded by ancient writers, who have most commonly ascribed the masculine singular form of an Arabic attributive to all nouns without exception, whether masculine or feminine, Arabic or Persian, singular or plural. Examples: **زَنِ صَاحِبِ تَهْمَالِ** "A beautiful woman;" **زَنَانِ صَاحِبِ تَهْمَالِ** "Beautiful women;" **لَقَمَةٌ لَطِيفٌ** "A pleasant morsel;" **اَوْصَافٌ بِخَيْرِ** "Good dispositions;" **مَسَائِلُ مُشْكِلٌ** "Difficult problems;" **حِكَايَاتِ لَطِيفَةٍ** "Pleasant stories;" &c. But though not of *necessary*, they must be considered of *optional* observance; since the examples of their operation are very numerous in most of the compositions of modern times; as **رَقِيبَةٌ كَرِيمَةٌ** "A generous letter;" **حَقِيقَتِ كَامِلَةٌ** "Perfect wisdom;" **حِكَايَاتِ لَطِيفَةٍ** "Pleasant stories;" **مَسَائِلُ مُشْكِلَةٍ** "Difficult problems;" &c. &c. And of their application to Persian substantive nouns in the feminine gender, or in the plural number, many examples might be adduced, such as **زَنِ بَعِيدَةٍ** "A beautiful woman;" **دُخْتَرِ شَبَابَةٍ** "A handsome girl;" **مَاجَرِهَائِ مَشْمُورَةٍ** "Inhabited houses;" and other combinations of the same nature.

It follows from the preceding observations; *first*, that there is no such thing as the concord of gender number and case, between

X x x

a given substantive and the PERSIAN attributive which is imputed to it; and, *secondly*, that in the case of an ARABIC attributive, the rules of concord may be disregarded without a breach of grammatical accuracy, since they are of *optional* but not of *necessary* observance. In my opinion, the non-existence of gender, in Persian attributives, will generally furnish a sufficient reason for disregarding the existence of gender in those Arabic adjectives that are of common occurrence in the Persian Tongue; and there are, perhaps, but two cases, in which a Persian scholar ought reasonably to have recourse to the distinctions of gender; namely, *first*, for the purpose of dispelling obscurity; and, *secondly*, in particular phrases, in compliance with the established usage of the Language. To explain by examples. In the absence of a given substantive noun, the distinctions of gender will be often useful; as *زَنِ فَايِسَقَه*, for *زَنِ فَايِسَقَه* or *زَنِ فَايِسَقَه*, (as opposed to *مَرَدِ فَايِسَقَه*) "An abandoned woman;" &c. and there are certain phrases, as *رَقِيبَتِه كَرِيمِه* "A generous letter," in which the use of the feminine gender may perhaps be considered as fully established by the authority of prescription. The words *رَقِيبَتِه كَرِيمِه* are undoubtedly accurate in a grammatical point of view, but the masculine seems nevertheless to have been generally superseded by the *feminine* gender, in this and other individual phrases, which can be known only by dint of experience.

It remains to remark the purposed omission, in this chapter, of a subject in itself of the highest importance; *namely*, the **DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER** of an Arabic or Persian attributive, as opposed to the attributives of the English and other European Tongues. The subject unquestionably belongs to this chapter, more properly than to any other part of the work; but the necessity of explaining to the English reader, the true nature of a Persian attributive, was very early impressed on my mind; and the ideas which I have formed on that subject are detailed accordingly, in the first volume, page 147 et seq. to the end of the

the chapter. I am satisfied that the general opinions, there stated, will stand the test of rigid enquiry; and duly understood and digested by the reader, will easily enable him to account for every important peculiarity in the use and application of Persian attributives, such as the frequent omission of a given substantive noun, and the employment of an attributive, whether simple or complex, to supply its place, &c. An attributive so employed will often receive, like any other substantive, the indefinite article, the prepositions; the termination را; and the sign of the plural number: as *دول از دست رفت* و *دول از دست رفت* و *دول از دست رفت* &c. و *ای دول از دست رفت* و *دول از دست رفت* را

HAVING detailed, as above mentioned, the general principles by which the accuracy of the application of a given attributive to a given substantive noun appears to be determined in the Persian Language, I shall not now waste the time of my readers by the repetition of what is there stated, or by the multiplication of individual examples, which themselves will be easily able to select. I therefore conclude this Chapter with one general observation, namely, that the Persian Language follows the order of nature, by ascribing simple attributives to those nouns only in which the imputed attributives are found to exist; (as PREGNANCY only to the female sex, WISDOM only to rational beings, &c.) and that the English Language admits the application of any adjective, not only to those nouns in which the imputed attributive may happen to exist, but also to all nouns, without exception, with which it has any conceivable relation; as KINDNESS to a letter; WISDOM to a law; HUMANITY to an institution; or VIRTUE to an action, &c. The difference between them consists, therefore, in the specific or indefinite relations which the adjectives of either Language are respectively formed to denote. Our adjectives denote invariably an INDEFINITE RELATION, and Persian adjectives denote almost invariably a SPECIFIC RELATION; with the exception, however, of those which belong to the class termed *منسوب* or

OF RELATIVE NOUNS. The figurative application of adjectives to nouns in which the imputed attribute has no real, but only a figurative existence, is undoubtedly common to both Tongues, but the figures of one Language will be often unintelligible in another Tongue, and therefore the Learner should be sparing in the use of figures (as A SMILING GARDEN for example) unsupported by the authority of prescription.

I NOW proceed to consider the rules that regard the application of the *إِسْمُ تَفْظِيلٍ* to the purposes of speech.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

إِسْمُ تَفْظِيلٍ

OR

NOUN OF SUPERIORITY.

ALL the Attributives of every Language may be divided into those which are POSITIVE; as MALE, FEMALE, ROUND, SQUARE, FULL, EMPTY, &c. and into those which are RELATIVE; as GOOD, WISE, JUST, VIRTUOUS, and other examples of the same nature. An attributive of the first class is naturally unsusceptible of the degrees of comparison, because, in the strict and proper sense of the terms, it must be incapable of intension and remission; as when we affirm that "Every woman is equally Female;" or in other words, that one individual cannot be more or less female than every other individual of the same sex. And if the words ROUND, SQUARE, FULL, EMPTY, &c. were used in the strict and proper sense of the terms, they would be also incapable of intension and remission; because nothing is perfectly round which is not absolutely a mathematical circle, and consequently nothing can be more than round. But we are accustomed, in common speech, to apply the term ROUND to every figure which

is nearly circular; and on that principle it may be accurately affirmed that either of two given figures is **ROUNDER**, that is to say, **MORE NEARLY CIRCULAR**, than the other with which we have occasion to compare it. With the exception of the words **MALE** and **FEMALE**, I conceive, therefore, that all the adjectives of the first class are commonly used in a relative sense, and therefore admit the degrees of comparison.

AND every adjective of the second class, denoting an idea merely relative, must be therefore capable of intension and remission; (term-
ed by the Persian (شَدَّتْ و زَهِنَتْ) and will consequently admit the degrees of comparison. For as the same temperature of the atmosphere will excite the opposite sensations of heat and cold in the same individual at different times, or in different individuals at the same time, so it must be obvious, that there is no point in the scale of the Thermometer at which heat can be absolutely and exclusively said to begin, nor any point so high as to exclude the idea of yet greater heat. The same thing happens so obviously in the case of **WISDOM**, **VIRTUE**, **JUSTICE**, **MERCY**, &c. &c. that it would be a waste of time to enlarge on the subject; and I shall therefore merely observe, that every adjective of the second class seems to imply a tacit comparison, even when employed in the positive degree. For we never ascribe to a man the epithets of **JUST**, **WISE**, **GREAT**, **VIRTUOUS**, &c. until we have first approved of his justice, wisdom, greatness, or virtue; and this I believe we cannot do, otherwise than by comparing his eminence in those attributes with the usual standard of ordinary men. Accordingly, the positive is often found in the Hindoostanee Language to usurp the place of the comparative and superlative degrees; and in the Persian Tongue there is one solitary adjective, namely, the word *Good*, in which the same principle may be often observed to operate; as خاموشی به از سخن بد است "Silence is better than evil speaking;" و سخن نیک به از خاموشی "And speaking well is better than silence;" &c.

Y y y

WITH

WITH this exception, the degrees of comparison are seldom found, in the Persian Language, to usurp the places of each other; and, on the contrary, the use and application of each degree will be found to accord very nearly with that of the corresponding degree of an English adjective.

THE term **اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ** is applied indiscriminately to mark the comparative and superlative degrees; and of the two nouns compared together by its means, the first or superior noun is termed **مُفَضَّل**; as opposed to the second, which is the **مُفَضَّلُ عَلَيْهِ**. If it be affirmed, for example, that "ZYDE is more learned than AMR;" ZYDE will then be the **مُفَضَّل** as opposed to AMR, who is the **مُفَضَّلُ عَلَيْهِ**.

THE following are all the rules that I have been able to collect in the Persian Language, regarding the application of the **اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ** to the purposes of speech.

R U L E F I R S T.

Two nouns compared together by means of the **اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ**, in the superlative degree, must be generally of the same class, and the last (being in the plural number) will be invariably connected with the **اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ** by means of the relation of the genitive case. Examples: **خوبترین لباسها زرّه است** "Armour is the best of clothes;" **و بهترین تاجها تاج و** "And a helmet is the best of crowns;" &c. A collective noun in the singular number may yet follow the **اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ** as **بهترین قوم** "The best of the tribe;" &c. And the same thing happens in the case of certain generic nouns; as **بهترین آب** "The best kind of water;" **خوشترین هوا** "The most pleasant kind of air;" &c.

R U L E

R U L E S E C O N D.

THERE are some exceptions to the preceding rule ; such as **JOSEPH** is the most beautiful of his brethren," which is held to be accurate, although **JOSEPH** is not among the number of his own brothers. The Persian Grammarians probably suppose that there is here a justifiable elipsis : " **JOSEPH** is the most beautiful of (the men) his brethren ;" and they will not suffer the critics to consider as a blemish, an omission so easily supplied by the understanding of the reader. Mr. ADDISON has condemned a similar expression of MILTON ; " The fairest of her daughters EVE," because EVE is not among the number of her own daughters. MILTON, however, has supplied the elipsis :— " The Goodliest he, of men since born his sons, the fairest of her daughters EVE ;" that is to say, the fairest EVE of women since born her daughters ; &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE **مُفَضَّلُ** is often rejected after an **إِسْمٌ تَفْضِيلِي** in the superlative degree ; the noun employed to supply its place being inserted for the mere purpose of explaining some circumstance relating to the **مُفَضَّلُ** with which it is connected. The **مُفَضَّلُ** must be supplied, in this case, by the understanding of the reader. To explain by an Example. The words **فَرْدَوْسِي** **فَضِيحَتَر** **بَيْنِ** **مُتَوَسَّاتِ** may doubtless signify " FERDOUSEE is the best poet (not of Persia but merely) of Toos," in which case the word **مُتَوَسَّاتِ**, or **أَهْلُ مُتَوَسَّاتِ**, will no doubt be the **مُفَضَّلُ**. But the sentence may also signify, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of every well informed native, that " FERDOUSEE is the best of the Persian poets ;" the word **مُتَوَسَّاتِ** being introduced merely for the purpose of denoting the place of his residence which happened to be Toos. In this case, the

the sense of the sentence may be rendered as follows :

“ فردوسی از آزادلو س اتمع اشترای فارسی است ” *Ferdousz of Toos is the best of the Persian poets ;* &c.

RULE FOURTH.

THE *استم تفضیل* in the comparative degree is commonly followed by the preposition *از* : as *زید و انار از بکر است* “ *Zyde is wiser than Buxr ;* ” &c. But sometimes, though rarely, the mark of the *اضافه* may be observed in this case to supersede the use of the preposition *از* : as *بازگو چک تر خود امیری باید کرد* “ *Do not put yourself on an equality with him who is meaner than yourself ;* ” &c. Two nouns compared together by means of the *استم تفضیل* in the comparative degree, are not necessarily of the same class ; but they must participate in the same attribute, as when we compare the swiftness of a horse with that of a camel or any other animal ; &c.

RULE FIFTH.

THE sense of two sentences may be compared together by means of the *استم تفضیل* in the comparative degree ; as *خاموشی بهتر از سخن بد است* “ *Silence is better than evil speaking ;* ” &c. Or the *مفضل علیہ* may be a demonstrative noun, referring to the following sentence with which it is connected by means of a relative pronoun. Example : *درة حقیر از آن نازل تر است که زبان به مخاطبه احباب مشاید* “ *This poor atom is too humble to open his mouth in conversation with thee ;* ” &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE *مفضل* may be accurately and elegantly omitted, whenever the omission can be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader.

EXAMPLE.

EXAMPLE.

چنان در جودت و حسن بیان مرده
کز آن خوشتر تصور کنم توان کرد

"So eminent for acuteness and eloquence that (nothing) can be easily conceived more delightful than it is." And the same rule is applicable to the *مُقَصِّرُ مَلِكِه* as *هَدَايِ تَكَايِ اَدَامَا رُو بِنَا تَرَا نَت* as "God is the wisest (of Beings);" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE *اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ*, in either degree, may be employed as a simple adjective noun; having the sense of what has been termed the intensive superlative by English Grammarians. Example: *سَبَر تَر دَا و د جَمَن رَا اَلْبَقَاشِ دَر خَرَا ن* "His attention preserves the garden very green even in the season of autumn,"

نَكُو بَمِ گَرَا مِ تَر مِ نِ گُو بَرِی سَبَر دَمِ بِنَا مِی تَر مِ نِ شُو بَرِی
"I will not say that I have given the noblest of ladies to the most renowned of husbands;" &c. In the last example the *اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ* is merely a simple adjective (the noblest lady, the most renowned husband,) applicable to the following substantive noun.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now detailed all the rules that regard the application of the *اِسْمِ تَفْضِيلِ* to the purposes of speech; and with this chapter I conclude that part of the syntax which relates to the use and application of Persian nouns. Of eleven chapters devoted to this subject, the first three are intended to illustrate the nature of nouns abstractedly considered, with reference to the distinction existing between them as PROPER NAMES, GENERIC NOUNS, or NOUNS OF TIME AND PLACE, &c. The seven following chapters are intended to illustrate the nature of nouns considered with refer-

Z z z

rence

rence to the grammatical character which they are found to assume in the structure of a sentence; as that of the **SUBJECT** or the **PREDICATE** of a given proposition; **THE AGENT** or **THE OBJECT** of a given verb; the **مُؤْتَوِّف**; the **مُؤْتَوِّف**; the **مُضَاف**; the **مُضَافُ إِلَيْهِ**; the **عَال**; the **مُتَّبِع**; the **بَدَل** &c. I am not aware that this arrangement can be improved, since any reader, who has taken the pains to comprehend the scheme of the work, may afterwards easily refer to the chapter that treats of a given subject, on which he desires to obtain information. In that chapter he will be sure to find the subject exhausted to the utmost of my ability; and if he should there fail to obtain the desired information, there is little hope that it will be found anywhere else. I have been ambitious to render this work useful, not merely to beginners, but as a book of reference to those who have made considerable progress in the study of Persian, and with that view have been earnestly desirous to preserve the advantage of a clear arrangement. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of Persian verbs.

O F V E R B S.

CHAPTER. FIRST.

OF THE VERBAL CHARACTER.

THE following observations on the nature of the verb are borrowed from the Grammatical treatise in the **ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA**.

“ Of all the constituent parts of speech, none has given the grammarians greater trouble than the **VERB**. The vast variety of circumstances which it blends together in one word, throws very considerable difficulties in the way of him who attempts to analyse it and ascertain its nature; at the same time, that by its eminent use in Language, it is entitled to all the attention which can be bestowed

bestowed upon it. To the discussion of the verb, Mr. HARRIS, whose notions of this as of the other parts of speech have been generally adopted by the subsequent writers on Grammar, has dedicated a large proportion of his book; in which he has thrown out many excellent observations, mixed, as it appears to us, with several errors. We have already observed, that no man is ignorant when he uses what is called a VERB and when a NOUN. Every schoolboy knows, that the words *IS, LOVETH, WALKETH, STAND-ETH* in English; and *EST, AMAT, AMATUR, AMBULAT, STAT,* in Latin, are VERBS: he knows likewise that they are of different kinds; that some of them are said to be *active*, some *passive*, and some *neuter*. But it should seem, that the first object of our investigation ought to be the *characteristic* of the verb, or that which all these words have in *common*, and which constitutes them VERBS, distinguishing them from every other species of words. Now it is obvious to the slightest attention, that every verb, whether active, passive, or neuter, may be resolved into the substantive verb *IS* and another ATTRIBUTIVE: for *LOVETH* is of the same import with *IS LOVING*; *WALKETH*, with *IS WALKING*; and *AMAT*, with *AMANS EST*. But *LOVING, WALKING, and AMANS*, are not verbs: whence it follows, that the characteristic of the verb, or that which constitutes it what it is, and cannot be expressed by other words, must be that which is signified by the word *IS*; and to us that appears to be neither more nor less than ASSERTION.

“ ASSERTION therefore, or PREDICATION, is certainly the very ESSENCE of the verb, as being that part of its office, and *that part only*, which cannot be discharged by other kinds of words. Every other circumstance which the verb includes, such as *attribute, mode, time, &c.* it may be possible to express by *adjectives, participles, and adverbs*; but without a *verb* it is impossible to *predicate*, to affirm or deny, any one thing of any other thing. The office of the verb, then, when stripped of all *accidental* circumstances, seems to be merely this, “ To join together the subject and

and predicate of a proposition:" its powers are analogous to those of the sign PLUS in Algebra, which does not affect the separate value of the quantities between which it is placed, but only indicates their *union* or *coalescence*. To explain by an example: when we say, *Cicero eloquens*, *Cicero wise*; these are imperfect sentences, though they denote a substance and an attribute. The reason is, that they want an assertion, to show that such an attribute appertains to such a substance. But when we insert the word *was*, we join the substance and attribute together; we give notice that the *wisdom* and *eloquence* are applied to *CICERO*, and we do thing more: we neither increase the wisdom nor diminish it, we neither make it real nor imaginary; for it was supposed in all its extent when the words *Cicero* and *wise* stood independent of each other. We may indeed use the verb in a form which implies not an *assertion* only but likewise an *attribute*; as when we say, *George writeth*, or *George walketh*: but as *whiteness* or any other particular colour is not of the *essence* of a *horse*, an animal which is found of all colours; so in the phrases quoted, the *attribute*, though implied, is not of the *essence* of the verb; for it may be equally well expressed by other words: *George is writing*, and *George is walking*, are phrases of the very same import with *George writeth* and *George walketh*.

" IN resolving every verb, whether active, passive or neuter, into the substantive verb *is* and another *attributive* we have the honour to agree with all the Grammarians; but to the word *is* itself the learned author of HERMES has given a meaning which, as a verb, it does not admit. He observes, that before any thing can be the subject of a proposition, it must *exist*: that all existence is either *absolute* or *qualified*, *mutable* or *immutable*: that the verb *is* can by itself express *absolute existence*, but never the *qualified*, without subjoining the particular form; and that it signifies both *mutable* and *immutable* existence, having in these cases different meanings; although the sentences which he gives as examples are evidently constructed in the same manner and consist of the same parts

parts of speech. His examples are: of *absolute* existence, B is; of *qualified*, B is an animal; of *mutable*, *This orange is ripe*; of *immutable*, *the diameter of the square is incommensurable with its side*. But if PREDICATION be the essence of verb, all this is nothing to the purpose, and part of it is not true. It is not true that the verb *is* ever varies its signification; for it hath as *verb* no connection with existence of any kind. All such circumstances are superadded to its verbal nature; or, to speak more accurately, we infer such circumstances from our previous knowledge of the objects concerning which the predication is made. When we say, "*this orange is ripe*," we do indeed mean, as Mr. HARRIS observes, that *it is so now at this present* in opposition to *past* and *future* time: but it is not the verb *is*, but the definitive *THIS*, which fixes the *time of maturity* as well as the *place* of the orange; for had we said, *oranges ARE ripe*, we might have been properly asked, *when* and *where* are they ripe? although the same verb is used in both sentences. Even in the sentence "*B is*," absolute existence (the most simple of all) is *inferred*, and not *expressed*, by the *verb*; and the inference is made from this obvious principle, "That when one utters a mark of *predication*, we naturally conclude that he means to predicate *something* of the subject. If he adds no *specific* predication, as B is ROUND, we apply to B the most general that we can; and what other species is so general as *existence*?"

THAT the idea of existence, considered as *mutable* or *immutable*, is not contained in the verb *is* itself, but is derived from our knowledge of the objects concerning which the predication is made, appears manifestly from this: That if a person be supposed ignorant of the meaning of the words GOD and MAN, whilst he knows that of *is*; the uttering of the two propositions, *God is happy*, and *this man is happy*, will give him no notice of existence considered as *mutable* or *immutable*, *temporary* or *eternal*. His conclusion with respect to these modes of existence, if any such conclusion be drawn at all, must be derived entirely from his

previous knowledge of the nature of GOD and the nature of MAN.

SOME of our readers may possibly think this notion of verb too abstract and metaphysical; yet what other circumstance than *mere predication* is essential to that species of word? We say *essential*; for we are here inquiring, not what is expressed by each *individual verb*, but what it is which is equally expressed by *all verbs*, and which distinguishes them from the *other parts of speech*. And if it be true, that every thing which the verb implies, *predication alone excepted*, may be expressed by other parts of speech, and that *no other part of speech can predicate*; then we think ourselves warranted to affirm, that *simple predication* is the *essential characteristic* of VERB, that every word which predicates is a VERB, and that *nothing* is so which does *not predicate*.

IT must not, however, be concealed, that a doctrine very different from this has been lately maintained by a writer of distinguished abilities. "We have *energy* expressed," says Dr. GREGORY, "and of course a verb constituted, *without affirmation*, when we wish or command; without *command*, when we affirm or wish; without *wish*, when we command or affirm: yet in all these cases we have equally and indisputably a verb."

THAT in all these cases we have a *verb*, is indeed indisputable; but we hold it to be equally indisputable, that in all these cases we have *affirmation*. The ingenious author has given no direct example of a *wish* or *command uttered without affirmation*; and a feeling or sentiment which is *not uttered*, has nothing to do with language: but he has given a sentence in which there are three verbs, that in his opinion denote *no affirmation*, but a very plain *supposition*. If a *supposition* can be expressed without affirmation, we shall very readily allow that a *wish* or *command* may be so expressed likewise. The Doctor's supposition is thus expressed: "Had any punishment ever overtaken you for your broken

VOWS;

vows; *were* but one of your teeth growing black, or even *were* but one of your nails growing less beautiful, I should believe you." It is almost superfluous to observe, that to every *verb* not in the infinitive mode there must be a *nominative*, and to every *active* verb an *object*, whatever be the arrangement of the sentence in which such verbs are found. These are truths known to every schoolboy; the reasons of them shall be given afterwards. It is likewise undeniable, that in the sentence before us, the nominative *To Had* is *any punishment*; to the first *were*, *one of your teeth*; and to the second, *one of your nails*. But the sentence arranged in grammatical order, with the several nominatives before their respective verbs, is evidently *elliptical*; and the conjunction *if* must be supplied as well to complete the construction as to make sense of the passage. "If any punishment had ever overtaken you; *if* but one of your teeth were growing black, or even *if* but one of your nails were growing less beautiful, I should believe you." Now it has lately been proved, by such evidence as leaves no room for doubt, that *if*, though called a *conjunction*, is in fact a *verb* in the imperative mode; of the same import with *give*; so that we may substitute the one for the other without in the smallest degree altering the sense. The sentence will then run thus: "Give, any punishment Had ever overtaken you; give but one of your teeth were growing black, &c. I should believe you." It is therefore so far from being true, that *HAD* and *WERE*, when the sentence is completed, express *no* affirmation; that it is only upon *granting* the *truth* of the *affirmation* which they denote, that the speaker says "I should believe you." "Any punishment had ever overtaken you," is plainly an affirmation; *if, give* that affirmation, *admit its truth*, "I should believe you."

BUT it cannot be supposed that *HAD* and *WERE* change their significations by a mere change of place, or that by being removed from the *middle* to the *beginning* of a clause, they lose their *original import*, and come to denote something *entirely different*.

ferent. Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain and fix the general principles of Grammar would be as ridiculous as an attempt to arrest the course of time. For what purpose then, it may be asked, if the verb *always* denotes *affirmation*, is it removed from the middle to the beginning of the clause, when *supposition* is implied as in the present instance? We answer, that supposition is neither more, nor less than *conditional affirmation*; that when such affirmation is *completely* expressed, the verb is *not* removed to the beginning of the clause; and that such removal takes place *only* when the clause is *elliptical*, being merely an artificial contrivance in language, to shew the reader or hearer that some such word as *if*, demanding the truth of the affirmation, is *omitted* for the sake of dispatch. This is evident; for when the word requiring the affirmation to be granted is *supplied*, the verb must be restored to its place in the middle of the clause. Such abbreviations, and such contrivances to mark them, are frequent in all languages, as will be seen more clearly when we come to treat of modes. Upon the whole, notwithstanding the deference which we willingly pay to this very masterly writer, we are compelled reluctantly to differ from him, and still to think that *simple predication* is the *very essence of the VERB*.

SHOULD we be required to exemplify our theory by language, and to produce instances of this simplified verb in practice, we might answer, that the not being able to produce such instances would be no good argument against the truth of our principles. It is the nature of language to express many circumstances by the same word, all of which however are *not essential* to distinguish the *species* to which that word belongs from the *other species* of words; and it is the nature of man to *infer* from discourse many things which are not *actually expressed*. Perhaps, however, something nearly approaching to an exemplification of our idea of a *simple verb* will be found in the following proposition: "The three angles of every plane triangle are equal to two right angles." What other office, the verb *are* here performs than simply

simply to join the subject and predicate, it is difficult to perceive. It does not give notice of *time*; or such notice, if given, is an imperfection; for the truth of the proposition is independent on time. Neither ought it to imply *existence*; for the proposition would be true, were there neither a triangle nor a right angle in nature.

"THIS idea of verb, when it is well considered, we hope will be found just; but should any of our readers suspect it of novelty, and on that account be disposed to condemn it, we have only to request that he will restrain his censure till he has examined the writings of others, and nicely observed the several postures of his own mind in discourse; for meditation may perhaps show him that our theory is not false, and inquiry will satisfy him that it is not novel."

* * * * *

BELIEVING that every assertion must by its very nature be partly or wholly true or false, I conceive the term ASSERTION is improperly used to denote the supposed essential characteristic of a verb. If I say to a servant "I desire you will bring me a glass of water," there is here a direct assertion of my own desire; (my desire is that you shall bring me a glass of water;) but if I substitute for these words, "Bring me a glass of water," there is then merely a simple COMMAND which is neither true nor false; because no command, expressed by means of a verb in the imperative mode, can be open to the suspicion of truth or falsehood. The assertion of my own desires may indeed be inferred from the commands which I utter in the imperative mode; because no man commands that which he does not desire; but this is merely an unexpressed *inference*, perfectly consistent with what has been stated; *namely*, that a verb in the IMPERATIVE, (and so also of the PRECATIVE, INTERROGATIVE MODES, &c.) does not directly denote ASSERTION, because the speaker cannot, in this case, be said to have uttered any thing which is absolutely and positively true or false.

THE argument of DOCTOR GREGORY is therefore untouched, in my opinion, by the proposed solution of the preceding example adduced by him. I will grant (though I think there is no necessity for such a concession) that the sentence "Had any punishment ever overtaken you," is in fact elliptical; and that the conjunction IF which is a corrupted imperative of the verb TO GIVE, must be supplied in order to complete the sense. The words "Any punishment had ever overtaken you" may be admitted also, to convey an assertion, though the sentence so expressed is not English in my opinion. "If any punishment had ever overtaken you" is good English; but the conjunction IF means GIVE; and GIVE is a verb in the imperative mode, which does not therefore denote assertion. We assert nothing but our own desire when we say to a friend "Give me a book;" and our own desire is not, in this case, directly asserted, but merely inferred from the very obvious principle already mentioned; *namely*, that no man commands or solicits that which is contrary to the tenor of his own desires.

THE word PREDICATION is a better term than the word ASSERTION, by which to denote the supposed essential characteristic of a verb. By the word PREDICATION, I understand "the office of uniting the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, in such a manner as to form a perfect sentence, whether conveying an assertion or not." In this sense of the term, the IMPERATIVE, PRECATIVE, and INTERROGATIVE modes, will immediately fall within the definition of a verb, without the necessity of having recourse to ellipsis; an engine perhaps too powerful to be used with safety on every occasion. ASSERTION is doubtless one sort of PREDICATION; but the latter may exist in the absence of assertion ("Give me a book;" "Is JAMES learned?" &c. &c.) and therefore constitutes the better term.

It may however be reasonably questioned whether we have any right to supply an ellipsis to the sentence "Had any punishment

punishment ever overtaken you ;” because the contrivance of prefixing the verb, “HAD,” to the nominative, PUNISHMENT. (for any thing I can perceive to the contrary,) does itself affect the sense of the sentence, as clearly as the insertion of the particle IF. In this case, the force of the phrase “ Had any punishment ever overtaken you,” is equivalent to that expressed by the words “ If any punishment had ever overtaken you ;” and there is no necessity for having recourse to the aid of an ellipsis at all. If the sentence “ Had any punishment ever overtaken you” were truly elliptical, it must be equivalent to the words “ Any punishment had ever overtaken you ;” and the necessity of supplying the particle IF, would be equally obvious in either case. But the insertion of the particle IF is inconsistent with the inverted order of speech, (“ Had any punishment ever overtaken you ;”) and thence I conclude that the sentence is not elliptical, because this very inversion of the order of speech is itself equivalent to the insertion of IF*.

FOR it must be obvious that the possible modes or inflexions of a verb have not been exhausted in any Language ; and though the interrogative, for example, is distinguished from the affirmative mode of an English verb, merely by inverting the order of speech, (“ JAMES is learned ;” “ Is JAMES learned ?”) it is easy to conceive a Language, in which each of these two modes of the verb might be distinguished by inflexions peculiar to itself. In such a case, the resource of an ellipsis would be of no avail, because the interrogative mode of the verb would be wholly incapable of conveying assertion ; that being the office of the affirmative mode, distinguished by a form peculiar to itself. In fact, the opinion of those who supply an ellipsis is obviously founded on the following supposition ; *namely*, that the radical import of a given phrase,

* I admit that the inverted order of speech is not *peculiar* to the conditional mode, since the interrogative mode is also formed by inverting the order of speech. This is by no means the only instance, in which the same form of the verb is employed for the accomplishment of more purposes than one.

" JAMES is learned ;" " Is JAMES learned ?" cannot be affected by any alteration of the order of speech. In my opinion it may be influenced as effectually by changing the order of speech, as it can be by the invention of a new inflexion ; and on the decision of this point the merits of the question appear to rest. I shall therefore merely observe, that every conceivable mode of the verb might be distinguished by a form peculiar to itself ; from which it follows that the preceding observations, applied by me to the INTERROGATIVE mode, are equally applicable to the CONDITIONAL or any other form of the verb.

" BUT it cannot be supposed that the words HAD and WERE, " change their significations by a mere change of place ; or that, " by being removed from the middle to the beginning of a clause, " they lose their original import, and come to denote something " entirely different. Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain " and fix the general principles of Grammar, would be as ridiculous as an attempt to arrest the course of time."

I DO not believe that the words HAD and WERE change their significations by a mere change of place ; because the sense of each, separately considered, is essentially the same in every example that can be adduced. It is a part of the idea which we entertain of the word WERE, that the nominative may be prefixed or subjoined at pleasure ; as " you were ;" and " were you ;" and that the interrogative, or conditional, or affirmative character of the sentence will generally depend on the order of speech. By this contrivance we might have put questions and stated conditions, &c. even though there were no such word as IF (or GIVE) in existence ; and this also is a possible case, in which the resource of an ellipsis would be of no avail. For though it is possible to express a question by having recourse to the aid of the particle IF following a verb in the imperative mode, (" Tell me if" &c.) it is equally obvious to express it by an inversion of the common order of speech ;

and

and for any thing I can perceive to the contrary, the expression of the question is equally perfect in either case.

HAVING admitted that the position of the words **HAD** and **WERE** has no effect on the abstracted signification of these words, I have nothing to do with the truth or falshood of the proposition contained in the sentence "Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain and fix the general principles of Grammar would be as ridiculous as an attempt to arrest the course of time." It is impossible, however, not to perceive that this is a branch of the same doctrine, by which we are informed that "every word has the same radical import, in every example that can be adduced." And as I have already shewn the falshood of this doctrine, (See Note to Vol. 1st, page 383) I shall only here observe; *first*, that if, by a word, we mean merely **A SOUND**, then the doctrine is palpably erroneous; as in the case of the word **BOX**; which signifies *a blow*, and also *a chest of wood*, two ideas which have no assimilation of any kind; and, *secondly*, that if, by a word, we mean **THAT WHICH REPRESENTS A GIVEN IDEA**, then there may be two words having the same sound; as in the case of the word **BOX**; which is one word in the sense of *a chest*, and another word in the sense of *a blow*.*

WITH regard to the investigation of Grammar, it is sufficient to observe that the grammatical importance of every word depends on the nature of the idea which it is formed to denote; and if it shall so happen, (as it does in truth very frequently happen,) that a given word or sound shall be employed, in a given Language, to denote more ideas than one; then we have only to admit the fact; and to assign it, if necessary, to more

* In the Arabic and Persian Tongues, the sense of a word often depends on that of the preposition with which it is connected; and thus **بکار می بردن** signifies "To undertake or set about the accomplishment of an affair," whereas **از کار می بردن** signifies "To finish an affair which had been previously undertaken."

than one of the parts of speech. The difficulties that relate to the investigation of Grammar will be neither increased nor diminished by that operation; nor will the science of Grammar furnish an object of less rational enquiry than it ever did.

ALL verbs have been justly considered as one species of ATTRIBUTIVES; yet if it be true that "simple predication is the essential characteristic of verb; that every word which predicates "is a verb, and that nothing is so which does not predicate;" it must be obvious, I think, that the attributive character is accidental and not essential to the verb. For a simple verb, deprived of its accidents, will be merely, in this case, a mark of predication; that is to say A CONNECTIVE employed to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; and, like other connectives, I shall endeavour to shew that it must be assigned to the class of particles, and not to the class of nouns or verbs. To explain by an example. We have the authority of all the Persian Lexicographers to affirm that the vowel *زید*, subjoined to the predicate of a given proposition, was anciently employed to denote PREDICATION; as *زید دینبر* "ZYDE is a writer;" and there is no reason whatever to question the accuracy of this information.

BUT I do not believe that the vowel *زید* is therefore a VERB, or an attributive of any kind; and on the contrary, I think it much more probable that the vowel *زید* is THE SAME PARTICLE, whether employed to indicate the *attributive* relation, as *مردنیک* "A good man;" or the relation of the *genitive case*, as *برادر زید* "The brother of ZYDE;" or the relation existing between the *subject* and the *predicate* of a given proposition, as *زید دینبر* "ZYDE is a writer." For the vowel *زید* does not specify the nature of the relation expressed by itself; but merely indicates the presence of some (no matter what) relation, the nature of which it is our business to discover if we can. And the discovery will not be generally a matter of difficulty; being effected,

settled, in the case of the **IZAFUT**, according to the principles stated in treating of that combination. And in the case of the attributive relation, as opposed to that which exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, there can be no room for any hesitation; because the vowel **کَـ**, being attributive, must be subjoined to the substantivenoun, as **زید دبیر** "The writer **ZYDE**;" whereas it will follow the adjective, as **زید دبیر** "ZYDE is a writer;" when the relation happens to be that of the subject to the predicate of a given proposition.

I DEEM this to be a better explanation of the nature of the vowel **کَـ** than any other I am able to offer; and if it be just, the following inference (in itself sufficiently probable) must be drawn of course: *namely*, that as there are connectives in every Language by which IMPERFECT COMBINATIONS are formed, as **OF**, **TO**, **IN**, **WITH**, **BY**, **FOR**; &c. so there *may be* in any Language, and in the Persian Language there formerly *were* connectives (namely, the vowel **کَـ** and the letter **نون**) by which PERFECT COMBINATIONS were formed; as **زید دبیر** "ZYDE is a writer;" **زید خوش** "ZYDE is happy;" &c. And if a given connective employed to form an *imperfect* combination may be truly a particle, as "a man of wisdom;" "a man of virtue;" &c. I can see no reason why a given connective, employed to form a *perfect* combination, may not be a particle on the same principle. The vowel **کَـ** and the letter **نون** are therefore PARTICLES in my opinion; and if so, there is no truth in the proposition "that every word which predicates must be a verb."

IT is true, however, that, "nothing is a verb which does not predicate," and therefore PREDICATION is doubtless essential to the verbal character.

BUT that is not *necessarily* a verb at all, (and is *never*, I think, a *perfect* verb,) which performs no other office but that of simple predication

dications alone; otherwise the vowel زِيد in the example زِيدٌ دَکِیْبِرٌ "ZYDE is a writer," must be a verb. But no man who is not wedded to a system, who has not assumed the principle that "every thing which predicates must be a verb," (and this is precisely the point to be proved) will believe that the vowel زِيد is here a verb. Its character is plainly that of a PARTICLE; and there is nothing contrary to reason or to common sense in the principle which I have assumed; *namely*, that one particle may be employed to establish the relation existing between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; as another particle may be employed to establish another relation of a different species; such, for example, as that expressed by the genitive case.

If it be asked whether the vowel زِيد, in the preceding example, performs any other office than that of SIMPLE PREDICATION; whether it indicates by the means of inflexion, the accidents of *time*; the variations of *person*; the distinctions of *number*, *mode*, *tense*, or *gender*, &c. &c. I answer that we have no account of its ability to perform any other office than that of simple predication alone; that it has no infinitive, no imperative, no inflexions of mode, number, person, tense, or gender, by which verbs are commonly distinguished; and that there is not, therefore, a single argument (except the mere circumstance of its employment as a mark of simple predication, if that shall in truth be deemed an argument,) by which its verbal character can be maintained for a moment. I shall now proceed to state, in a few words, the idea which I entertain of the nature and character of a PERFECT VERB.

I CONCEIVE a perfect verb to be a word derived from the infinitive, for the purpose of ascribing (with or without reference to the accident of time,) the sense of that infinitive to a given object or substantive noun, in such a manner as to form a perfect sentence, whether conveying an assertion or not;

as JOHN SLEEPETH, or DOES HE SLEEP; JAMES LOVETH, or DOES HE LOVE; and other examples of the same nature. But certain verbs, such as the word IS, are often found to ascribe the sense, not of their own, but of another infinitive, to a given object or substantive noun; as when we say of the DEITY, that "He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;" &c. For it is not BEING or EXISTENCE, but SAMENESS or UNITY, or the possession of a nature unsusceptible of change, which is here doubtless ascribed to the DEITY; and in this case, the word IS appears to have lost a part of that character which is essential to the nature of a perfect verb.

When so employed, it is accordingly termed AN IMPERFECT VERB by the Persian Grammarians; and the process by which it has acquired that character, is known to them by the term **تَجْرِید**. The word **تَجْرِید** signifies TO STRIP; and in its technical application, it means "To banish from a word a part of the sense which that word was originally formed to denote." As a perfect verb, the word TO BE means TO EXIST; and in this sense, we predicate the BEING or EXISTENCE of GOD. "GOD IS" forms in itself a perfect proposition; in which, notwithstanding the opposite opinion of certain Grammarians, I do not believe that the predicate is wanting. The predicate (is) being here a perfect verb, affirms the existence of BEING in GOD; and the connective sense, the affirmation, implied in the word IS, constitutes a part, only, of the idea signified by that word; which part we are at liberty to retain, after the second component part of the idea, signified by the adjective EXTENT, shall have been banished by that operation of the mind which the term **تَجْرِید** is meant to describe. The influence of **تَجْرِید** might be illustrated by many examples of common occurrence in the Arabic Language; and there is not, probably, any Language in the world, in which this natural operation of the mind may not be observed to have some effect.

BUT it seems to me that there are two species of imperfect

verbs ; the first comprising those already described, which form the link of connexion between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition ; as, " JAMES *is* virtuous ;" " JAMES *became* rich ;" &c. and the second comprising those, commonly termed AUXILIARY, by which we are enabled to modify the sense of a given infinitive, in such a manner as to form, as it were, a tense of the verb to which the auxiliary may happen to be imputed : as " JAMES *can* love ;" " JAMES *may* read ;" and other examples of the same nature.

THE imperfect verbs of either class are not very numerous in any Language ; but though not numerous, they are of constant use and will therefore deserve the attention of the reader. I now proceed to consider the use and application of imperfect verbs.

CHAPTER SECOND.

اَقْبَالَ نَاقِصَهُ

OR

IMPERFECT VERBS.

SECTION FIRST.

اَسْتَ OR اَمْتُ Is.

THERE seems to be no difference of sense between these verbs, either of which may assume, occasionally, the character of a perfect verb, (HE IS, or HE EXISTS ;) but that character is more commonly applicable to the verb اَمْتُ than to the verb اَسْتَ, in which it is rarely found to occur. Of its occasional occurrence, the following is an example from the GOOLISTAUN of SAADEE : اَزْ اَنْجَا كَرِ اِمْتِ دَرِ وَشَانِ اَسْتَ اِمْتِ اَمْرَاهُ مِنْ كُنْشِيدِ and it would be difficult, perhaps, to produce another. The inflexions of both must have been originally the same : اَسْتِ , اَمْتِ , اَمْتِمِ ;

اَسْتَم : اَسْتِ : اَسْتِم : اَسْتُم : اَسْتُمْ ; but the verb اَسْتَم is now generally contracted into اَم : اَي : اُتَم : اُتْم : اُتُم ; and the old inflexions are seldom or never used, except occasionally, in combination with the tenses of a Persian verb: as اَشْتَمِي , اَشْتَمِيْتُمْ , اَشْتَمِيْتُمْ , &c.

IT is perfectly obvious that those inflexions are derived from the obsolete infinitive *استن* or *استن*; by rejecting the letter *نون* of the infinitive, according to the rule which is applicable to the formation of the PRETERITE TENSE of all Persian verbs. But these verbs are no longer significant of PAST TIME, and have therefore apparently suffered the operation already described by the term *مخبرند*. The sense of past time (as well as the attributive sense) having been rejected by that operation, they are no longer significant of *past present*, or *future time*; but merely (in the nature of a *رابط*, or CONNECTIVE) indicate the *union* of the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, in such a manner as to form a perfect sentence, without reference to the accident of time.

THEY are accordingly employed to form a great variety of propositions, the truth of which has no dependence on time, as **خدا کریم است** "GOD is beneficent," and other similar examples; in stating which, it would be injurious to our conceptions of the truth to introduce the restrictions of time at all. For those restrictions are never usefully introduced into the terms of a proposition which is eternally true; and they are positively injurious, if they convey to the mind of the hearer what seems to be a natural inference from the limitation of a given proposition to past, present, or future time, *namely*, that the proposition is *not* eternally true.

I SAY this is a natural inference, because the restrictions of time

time answer no useful purpose in Language, but that of distinguishing the periods at which a given proposition which is sometimes true, and sometimes false, may happen to be positively true or false.

BUT in the absence of time expressed by the verb, it is probable that *present time* will be often inferred; for if the proposition shall be of such a nature as to be sometimes true and sometimes false, the period if its truth or falsehood *should* be expressed by the tenses of the verb. And if we employ in the statement of such a proposition a simple mark of predication (as the vowel كَسْرَه or the letter نون) which has no reference to past, present, or future time; or if we employ a verb (as بُسْتُ or اُسْتُ) originally significant of past time, and subsequently used as a mark of simple predication, having no reference to the accident of time; then I conceive, that in either case present time will be commonly *inferred* on general principles: and if we mean to indicate past or future time, there must, I suppose, be something in the context by which the judgment of the hearer may be led to the truth.

In this case, we can trace every step of the process by which the verbs اُسْتُ and بُسْتُ, originally significant of past time, are now often employed to indicate present time; but the opinion which I have stated is mere hypothesis, and the reader will therefore adopt or reject it according to the dictates of his own judgment. That the verb اُسْتُ was originally significant of past time is, however, a fact for which we have the clearest evidence; for independently of the form of the verb itself, which is obviously that of the preterite tense, it is still significant of past time when followed by the letter ياء مجهول, as in the following example from the كَبْتَان of SAADEE: “لَا نَقْدِرُ مِنْ اُسْتِي كِهْ بَا زَاغِي بِرْ دَرْتُوا اِرْ بَاغِي خَرِ اَمَانِ هِي رَنْجِي” It would have suited my dignity to have walked with the crow on the

the garden wall," &c. The words *این فدر من آستنی* are here obviously used for *این فدر من آن بودی*, and there are many other examples of the same nature, as

یوحنا اگرتینتینی فدر وی سبروی کس اندر جهان نام می
&c. &c.

I NOW proceed to detail the rules that regulate the application of the verbs *است* and *هست* to the purposes of speech, but the subject is rather difficult, and I am by no means certain that the reader will have reason to applaud the success of my endeavours to place it in a clear point of view.

R U L E F I R S T.

THESE verbs are indifferently used to unite the extreme terms of a given proposition employed to affirm an eternal truth, or what is believed to be eternally or generally true. Examples: *خدا کریم است* "God is beneficent;" *رای بی قوت فوون است* "Understanding without power is of no use;" *و قوت بی رای جهل و خستون* "And power without wisdom is folly and madness;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THEY may be employed to unite the extreme terms of a given proposition which is true in present, as opposed to past and future time. Example: *زید زوئده است* or *زید روان است* "ZYDE is now walking;" &c. But these words may also signify "ZYDE is about to walk;" because that which is expected to happen soon is often stated as already present.

R U L E T H I R D.

THEY may be employed to unite a given subject with the predicate which is *commonly* or *habitually*, perhaps not *presently*, applicable to it. Example: *زید نویسنده است* "ZYDE is a
4 E writer;"

writer," either occasionally, or by his profession, whether he is writing at present or not.

RULE FOURTH.

THEY may be employed to unite a given subject with the predicate to which it was *formerly* applicable; the connexion having subsequently ceased to exist. Example: اسکندر رومی است "ALEXANDER is a Grecian;" in which case است is obviously convertible with بود; as when we say, with equal accuracy, اسکندر رومی بود "ALEXANDER was a Grecian;" &c. &c. The difference between the examples appears to consist in this; that the word IS refers the sense of the proposition to the present conceptions which we entertain; whereas the word WAS refers it to that period of past time in which ALEXANDER happened to live. He still lives a Grecian in our memory, and therefore we employ the verb IS; but he has been long dead as a matter of fact, and therefore we employ, also, the verb WAS.

RULE FIFTH.

THE word است may supply the place of the aorist باشد, and will be consequently significant of future time, in both members, or in either member of a conditional sentence, comprising a جزا and a شرط. Examples:

اگر زید تند مزاج است (نشد مزاج باشد) کی با بکر سازگار خواهد شد

"If ZYDE be of a hasty temper, how is it possible that he can agree with BUKR;"

جوهر اگر در سلاب افتد همچنان نفیس است (نیفیس باشد)

"If a Jewel fall into the dirt, it will yet be valuable;"

و اگر در پی چنین دل آزاری است (دل آزاری باشد) بکجا با و صورت سازگاری است (صورت سازگاری باشد)

"If my mistress continue to treat me thus, how is it possible that I can submit;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

THE same rule is optionally applicable to both members, or to either member of a sentence comprising a general proposition expressed by means of a relative pronoun. Example:

همر که دشمن در پیش است (دشمن پیش باشد)
اگر نکشد دشمن خویش است (دشمن خویش باشد)

“Whoever has (or shall have) an enemy to deal with, if he kill him not, is (or WILL BE) his own enemy;” &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE same rule is optionally applicable to every sentence comprising two members, of which the duration of one is limited by that of the other. Example: (نارنجده باشد)

Am avaricious man, while he lives, (or shall live) continues (or will continue) to be miserable;” &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

THE preterperfect tense of every Persian verb is formed by compounding the past participle with the verb است: as گفته است; زفته است; کرده است; &c. And in this case, است may be optionally employed to supply the place of the aorist باشد in any given proposition, which, though future, is yet believed to be of certain occurrence. Examples:

قزو است که قاسم آجیل ناگهان خط خطان بر نفس این و آن کشیده است (کشیده باشد) “It is to-morrow that the pen of sudden death shall have drawn (has drawn) the line of expunction over the characters of animated nature;”

و پستی زین شاه و گدا از تندی سلاب فنا هموار و یکان گردیده است (گردیده باشد) “And that the rank of the king and the begger shall have been reduced to a level (has become even) by the sweeping torrent of mortality;” &c.

REMARKS.

R E M A R K S.

It may perhaps be contended by certain Grammarians, that the use of the past tense *گرفته است*, *کشیده است*, depends, in these examples, on the following principle: *namely*, that the events comprised in either proposition are considered as *past* with reference to that period of *future* time which the word *و فر* is meant to express. "When tomorrow shall be present, these events will then be past". The fact may be true, but there are many examples in which we cannot have recourse to that kind of argument, such as the following from the GOOLISTAUN of SAADÉ:
 نماند سائیم طای و یک ما با بد و ماند نام بکندش به نیگویی مشهور
 "HATIME TAE lives no longer (has not remained), but his reputation will survive (has survived) for his virtue to all *future* eternity." Now it is obvious that his reputation has not *yet* survived to all future eternity, and that there is no period of future time at which it can be truly said to have *already* survived to all future eternity; and therefore it is, that an Englishman must in this case employ the future tense of the verb: "His reputation *will* survive to all future eternity." But I ask why it happens that Persian idiom admits in the example before us the employment of the past tense of the verb; and to this question I conceive it will be impossible to return any other than the following answer; *namely*, that the reputation of HATIM is already established; that the speaker believes it will endure for ever, and that the idiom and genius of the Persian Language admits the use of the past tense in the statement of this and every other proposition, which, though future, is nevertheless deemed to be of certain occurrence. I think it necessary to remark, for the benefit of those readers who are little acquainted with the niceties of Persian idiom, that *ماند* is here certainly in the past tense; and that the measure of the verse will not, in the example before us, admit the substitution of the aorist *ماند*.

RULE

R U L E N I N T H.

THE word است, compounded with the past or passive participle of a Persian verb, does by no means form invariably the preterperfect tense of the verb. On the contrary, the context must determine whether or not the participle is to be considered as a component part of that tense, or merely as a simple adjective noun: as مرده است "He has died," or "He is dead;" خفته است "He has slept;" or "He is asleep;" &c. &c. Example: ترا بهستم از هر چه بر دواخته است که هستی و سازنده او است خفته است "I see thee in every thing which is created! that thou art the CREATOR, and it is thy work." It must be obvious to the reader that the participles بر دواخته and خفته, are here considered as simple adjective nouns.

R U L E T E N T H.

THE verb است may coalesce with a noun significant of any given period of *past*, *present*, or *future* time; as فردا است "It is to-morrow;" دیروز است "It was yesterday;" امروز است "It is to-day;" &c. &c. So also in French, "C'est hier;" "C'est demain;" "C'est aujourd'hui;" &c. on a principle which I do not perfectly understand. I am disposed to believe that است is thus capable of coalescing with nouns significant of past, present and future time, because it is itself no longer significant of time. Perhaps too, what has been commonly termed the *present* tense of the verb is in fact the *simple* verb, having no reference to the accident of time. I confess my inability to decide the question, and will therefore leave it to the judgment of the reader with one only observation; *namely*, that as there is not, in fact, any such thing as present time, which is nothing more than a mere fiction of the mind, so it follows that any portion of *past* and *future* time may be therefore accurately assumed as *present*. Thus it is that we speak of *the present day*, *the present hour*, *the present week*, *the present century*, &c. although

Time exists only in succession, from which it follows, that the parts of a moment are *past* and *future* with reference to each other, as certainly as those of a year.

R U L E E L E V E N T H.

THE word است, employed as a component part of the preterperfect tense of a verb, should follow, without the intervention of any other word, the past participle of the verb with which it is compounded: as زید آمده است "ZYDE has come;" زید توانگر شده است "ZYDE has slain BUKR;" زید بکر رانشته است "ZYDE has become rich;" &c. But in poetry, the two component parts of the tense may be separated by the intervention of other words. Example: انگشتِ خجیرِ نعلِ دندانِ من سرشته است for انگشتِ خجیرِ نعلِ دندانِ من سرشته است "The finger of perplexity has become the repast of my teeth," that is to say, "I am continually biting my nails, as a mark of the perplexity under which I suffer."

C O N C L U S I O N.

THE preceding rules are generally applicable to the verbs است and هست in both numbers, and in all persons; and the difference (if any) between these verbs, must be considered as of little importance. I have already stated that هست is generally employed as a PERFECT VERB, and that است is most commonly a mere connective or IMPERFECT VERB, employed to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition. The former cannot be combined with the past participle of a Persian verb, in order to form the preterperfect tense, whereas the latter may be so combined. It is proper to remark that there is another verb, namely the word می so well known to Hindoostanee Grammar, which may be sometimes observed to occur in Persian. This word is said to have belonged originally

nally to the DUREE dialect; and is recorded accordingly, in every Persian Dictionary. It occurs twice in the following lines of HAFIZ: *first*, as a substantive verb, synonymous with است, and *secondly*, as a *كلمه تنبيه* OR PARTICLE OF ADMONITION corresponding with "Ho! Have a care!" in English.

شای اگر ت هوای مای جز باده مبار پیش مای

"O cup bearer! if you have any affection for us, bring us, I pray you, nothing but wine."

THE rules that relate to the omission or insertion of the letter *الف* of the word است, are purposely omitted in this chapter, because most of them have already been detailed in a note to the first volume, page 75 et seq.

SECTION SECOND.

بودن TO BE; WITH ALL ITS INFLEXIONS.

As a perfect verb, the word بودن signifies EXISTENCE; *ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار بود تا شرف ندارد و درین کار سود* "But what avails it! now that the thing has been, (or existed) repentance is no longer of any use."* As an imperfect verb, it is employed simply as a mark of predication, having a reference to past time in the past tense of the verb; as *زید توانگر بود* "ZYDE was rich;" *بکر نویسنده بود* "BUKR was a writer;" &c.

* I am not quite certain that the place of *تو* may not here be more accurately supplied by the verb *شود*; (for *شود* است کاین کار *شود*); *ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار شود تا شرف ندارد و درین کار سود* "But what avails it! now that the thing is past or over;" &c. The copies of the *سکندرنامه* in my possession read *تو*, not *شود*; but I leave the question to be determined by the judgment of the reader.

That

That tense may be compounded with the inflexions of the verb است; and will be found, in this case, to indicate the *uninterrupted* existence of a given attribute in the substantive noun to which it is imputed: as زید تو آنکرم بود و است "ZYDE has been (hitherto uninterruptedly) rich;" &c. As an auxiliary, the word بود forms a component part of the pluperfect tense of every Persian verb; (گشته بود; گشته بود; رفته بود; &c.) and as it cannot be accurately compounded with itself, (بوده بود) it is therefore destitute of the pluperfect tense, notwithstanding the ingenuity of Sir WILLIAM JONES, who has supplied the omission by the invention of بوده شده, a combination, the meaning of which I do not pretend to be able to understand. The application of بود to the purposes of speech, admits of no illustration by the rules of Grammar, and I proceed, therefore, to detail the rules that relate to the application of the aorist بود or باشد.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE Aorist باشد may be combined with the past participle of a Persian verb, for the purpose of forming a tense which has obtained the name of the ماضی مشکوک or DOUBTFUL PRETERITE: as آمده باشد "He *may* have come;" رفته باشد "He *may* have gone;" گشته باشد "He *may* have slain;" &c. But this tense has also a continuative sense, as هر روز از نزد من آمده باشد "He will *continue* to visit me daily;" and there is nothing but the context by which to determine the difference between them. In the continuative sense, I conceive باشد to be a PERFECT VERB significant of EXISTENCE: "He will EXIST (or CONTINUE) in the state of having come to visit me every day;" and in the doubtful sense, it is probably an IMPERFECT VERB, employed as a mark of doubtful predication.

R U L E

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE reader is aware that the same rule is applicable to the formation of the *simple passive* and the *past active* participle of all Persian verbs : as شسته " Having slain ;" or " The person slain ;" دیده " Having seen ;" or " The thing seen ;" &c. &c. And hence it happens that the words شسته باشد (and so also of every similar example) admit of a double sense : " He may have slain ;" (that is to say, " He may be the person *having* slain such a one ;") or " He may be slain ;" that is to say, " He himself may be the person slain ;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE aorist باشد may form the link of connexion between a given subject and the following attributive which is imputed to it : as زنگی نادان باشد و رومی زیرک " An Ethiopian will be generally ignorant, and a Grecian will be generally intelligent ;" کافر دیر بخت خوش باشد و دُر آفتاب ناخوش " An infidel will be happy in this world, and miserable in the other ;" &c. It is not to be doubted that the last proposition might be accurately rendered by the verb است (کافر دیر بخت خوش است و دُر آفتاب ناخوش) and I ask, therefore, in what consists the difference of sense between these verbs, or to what propositions they are respectively applicable ? It seems to me, that though either may often supply the place of the other, the verb است, employed in its proper sense, indicates the POSITIVE existence of the predicate in a given object or substantive noun ; as زید زیرک است " ZYDE is intelligent ;" &c. And the verb باشد, on the contrary, indicates the POSSIBLE, or the PROBABLE existence of a given attribute in the substantive noun to which it is imputed ; as زید زیرک باشد " ZYDE may be intelligent ;" that is to say, " I know no reason why he should be otherwise ;" زنگی سیاه باشد " An Ethiopian will be black," or " He may be black," or " He may well be black."

considering the necessary effects of the climate under which he is born, &c. If there be any truth in this observation, the verb **است** is most properly applicable to the statement of **FACTS**, and the verb **باشد** to the statement of **OPINIONS**.

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE word **باشد**, as a perfect verb, may be followed by a sentence to which it forms the predicate, and the sentence, in that case, will follow the particle **که** *That*. Examples: **باشد که زبید بیاید** "It may be that ZYDE will come;" **باشد که زین بیانه یکی کارگر شود** "It may be that one of these (arrows of prayer) will hit the mark," &c. As a perfect verb, the word **باشد** also often signifies **TO BE** or **TO REMAIN**; in which sense, its inflexions have been detailed in the first volume.

R U L E F I F T H.

THE Aorist **بود** is never employed to form the **DOUBTFUL PRETERITE**, or that **CONTINUATIVE TENSE**, to which I have referred in the first and second rules. With this exception, all the rules are indifferently applicable to **بود** or **باشد**; but the former is, comparatively speaking, of rare occurrence in the Language. Examples: **کافر در اینجا خوش بود و در آنجا ناخوش** "An infidel will be happy in this world, and miserable in the other;" **بود که پرتو نور بیام ما** "It may be, that a ray of light will be directed to my habitation," &c.

SECTION THIRD.

شدن TO BE; WITH ALL ITS INFLEXIONS.

THE verb **شدن**, as an **IMPERFECT VERB**, signifies **TO BE** or **TO BECOME**; that is to say, it indicates a change in the noun which forms the **SUBJECT** of a given proposition, either from

from one STATE to another, as in the following example: عَصَا رَه نَافِي بُقَدَر تَش شَهِيد مَاتِق شُد. "The juice of the cane, by his almighty power, is converted into sugar;" (has become excellent honey;) or from one ATTRIBUTE to another of an opposite nature: as زِيد تَوَا نَكْر شُد "ZYDE! has become rich;" (having previously been poor;) و مَن فَنَسِر شُدَم "And I have become poor;" (having lost the riches which I previously possessed;) &c.

THE inflexions of this verb are combined with the PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, in order to form the passive voice of every Persian verb of the transitive class: as خط نُو شْتِه مِی شَوَد و نُو شْتِه شُد و نُو شْتِه خَوَا هَد شُد "The letter is now a writing," or "It has been written;" or "It will be written;" &c. And though certain Grammarians have remarked that the fact is not universally true, because we cannot accurately employ the verb شَبْدِه شُدِی or شَبْدِه شُدَم in the first and second persons of the past (or any other) tense of the passive voice, I answer that the reason is obviously this: *namely*, because the nominative to every passive verb must be that noun to which the verb is transitive in the active voice. Now the verb TO HEAR is obviously transitive to words significant of *sound* as سخن Speech; &c. and it is merely by the idiom of our language that we are justified in stating that "we have heard the SPEAKER;" when in fact we have heard nothing but the WORDS or SOUNDS which he may have had occasion to utter in our presence. The nominative to the passive verb شَبْدِه شُد must, therefore, be a word significant of SOUND; "سخن شَبْدِه شُد" "The SPEECH has been heard;" and the examples مَن شَبْدِه شُدَم , زِيد شَبْدِه شُد , تو شَبْدِه شُدِی are equally inaccurate, not because the verb شُدَن is not applicable to the formation of the passive voice of every Persian verb of the transitive class, but because certain verbs, such as شَبْدَن TO HEAR, will not, in the passive voice, receive a nominative which is significant of the name of a RATIONAL BEING. On this subject I refer the reader

to CHAPTER SIXTH, PAGE 184, of this VOLUME; and will here venture to express my wonder that so plain a principle should have escaped the sagacity of MOLOVEE AMER HYDER, a man whose attention was eminently devoted to the elucidation of the principles of Persian Grammar.

THE verb **شَدَن** is sometimes compounded with the past participle of neuter verbs, which (so employed) must be considered in the light of simple adjective nouns: as
 “هر چه بَر دست و زبان ملک رفته شود با قیاه گفته شود” What-
 ever is done or said by kings, will be talked of by other men;”
 but this I believe to be a rare occurrence, notwithstanding the unexceptionable accuracy of the preceding example (**رفته شود**)
 which is supported by the authority of the poet JAUMEE.

As a perfect verb, the word **شَدَن** may supply the place of
 “شَد بر محتسب و کار بدستوری زد” She (the
 daughter of the grape, a personification of wine,) has repaired or
 gone to the MOOHT ÜSIB, (a censor whose duty it is to superintend
 the public morals, and more especially to prevent the use of wine,)
 and has acted as usual;” that is to say, “she has gained him over to
 her own side of the question, or has induced him, by the power of
 her charms, to commit a breach of duty by permitting the public
 to indulge in the fascinating pleasures of wine, which he himself
 had not the resolution to resist.” It may be also employed in se-
 veral other senses; as **خبر شد** “News has reached me;”
یاران را چه شد “What has happened to my friends;”
در نمازت چه شد از پشت خم است چون مرا قبله بسمت شکم است
 “What avail your prayers, although your back is bent (in
 seeming adoration,) since in fact, you are an abject slave to your
 belly;” &c. I do not perfectly understand the principle on
 which the verb **شَدَن** is thus employed, but suppose it denotes
 some GENERAL IDEA, which must be therefore variously trans-
 lated, according to the examples in which it may happen to
 occur.

گردیدن

گَرْدِیدن or شستن TO BE OR TO BECOME.

THESE verbs are not unfrequently combined with the passive participle, for the purpose of forming the passive voice of certain Persian verbs: as *مَشْتَن گشت* or *گَرْدِید* for *مَشْتَن شد* "He was slain;" &c. And in this case, they are exactly synonymous with the verb *شدن*; but the latter may be combined with all Persian verbs of the transitive class without any exception, whereas, in the case of *شستن* or *گَرْدِیدن*, the accuracy of the combination seems to depend on the authority of prescription. I should not hesitate to use the phrase *زُدِه شد*, whether supported by authority or not; but I would refrain from the use of *زُدِه گشت* or *زُدِه گَرْدِید* unless, (which I do not believe,) it can be supported by sufficient authority.

THE words *شستن* or *گَرْدِیدن*, like the verb *شدن*, indicate a change in the noun which forms the subject of a given proposition, either from one state to another; as *قطره آب در گَرْدِید* "The drop of water became a pearl;" or from one attribute to another of an opposite nature; as *زید توانگر گشت* or *زید توانگر گردید* "ZYDE became rich;" &c. In this sense, either verb may, I suppose, be applied by analogy to any given proposition, whether supported by the authority of prescription or not.

As perfect verbs they may supply the place of *سَرگَرْدَن* TO TRAVEL; as *دُر اَقْبای عالم بِگَشتم بسی* "I have travelled much in the world;" *دیر روز در باغ می گَرْدِیدم* "I was walking yesterday in the Garden;" &c. Or of *مُتَغَیِر شدن* TO SUFFER CHANGE as *که خاش بگرْدِید و رُنگش بر تَحْت* "His state was changed, and the color fled from his cheeks;" &c.

آید آمد

THESE two words are sometimes (though rarely) compounded with the passive participle, in order to form the passive voice of certain Persian verbs: as **سُئِنِ دُرُستِ گُفتِه آمد** "A just observation has been uttered;" **بِرِیِ شایِدِ کِرْدَنِ دُرُستِ گُفتِه آمد** "It is proper that good actions should be performed;" &c. They are never so employed but in the third person singular, and then by the authority of prescription alone.

CONCLUSION.

FROM the contents of the second and third sections of this chapter, it must be obvious to the reader, that the sense of the verb **بُودَن** is by no means to be confounded with that of **شُدَن** TO BE. There are, perhaps, certain examples in which the one may supply the place of the other, such as **وَلَيْسَ كَيْفَ بَرِيْدِ كَارِ بُودَ نَاسِتِ نَدَارِ وَ دُرِيْنِ كَارِ شُودَ** "But what avails it! Now that the thing has once been, (or existed,) regret, in this case, is of no use;" &c. I have already stated that the word **بُودَ** might be here advantageously exchanged for **شُودَ**, the ancient form of **شُدَ** "But what avails it! **وَلَيْسَ كَيْفَ بَرِيْدِ كَارِ بُودَ نَاسِتِ نَدَارِ وَ دُرِيْنِ كَارِ شُودَ** (or **شُدَ**)" &c.) and many are of opinion that the Poet (NEZAUME) must have written **شُودَ**, instead of **بُودَ** which they consider to be here erroneous. The two copies of the **سَكَنْدَرِ نَامَه** now in my possession, have **بُودَ** not **شُودَ**; but I have no dependence on the accuracy of either, and can therefore scarcely venture to offer an opinion. I do not believe that **بُودَ** is an error, although I have little doubt that **شُودَ** (or **شُدَ**) is more commonly used than **بُودَ** in all the examples of this class. The words **زَيْدِ دُرُ وَ بَرِيْشِ بُودَ اَكْتُونِ نَوَا كَرِ شُدَ** "ZYDE was poor, but now

now he is rich;" furnish a very good example of the difference of sense between **بود** and **شد**; since it would be absolute nonsense to say **زید در وقتش شد آفتون توانگر بود**, except in the following sense; *namely*, that "ZYDE has become poor, whereas he was rich but now," that is to say, a short time ago.

As the verb **شد** is often lengthened by the Poets into **شود**, so is the verb **بود** often contracted into **بد** through all its inflexions: (**بدم**, **بدی**, **بدید**, **بدیم**, **بیدید**, **بدند**, **بیدند**) as in the following example, in which FIRDOUSEE has ventured to anticipate the judgment of posterity on the merits of his genius.

چو ز دویسی اندر زمانه نبود بد آن بد که بخش جوانه نبود

"TIME has never produced a genius equal to that of FIRDOUSEE, unfortunate only in this, that the fates were not propitious to him!"

SECTION FOURTH.

خواستن To Wish.

THERE is little to be observed on the application of this word to the purposes of speech. As an AUXILIARY, it is combined with the infinitive, or the *Hafle Musfder*, (by rejecting the letter **ن** of the infinitive) for the purpose of forming the future tense of all Persian verbs without exception; as **خواهم کرد** (rarely **خواتم کردن**) "I will do," **خواهم رفت** (rarely **خواتم رفتن**) "I will go," &c. In poetry, the two component parts of the tense are sometimes reversed in the order of speech: as **چو رخت از مملکت بر بست خواهی** (**خواهی بر بست**) "When you are about to take your departure from a country; &c. and they

are

are sometimes separated by the intervention of other words, as *آخِر بَرَسَر خَواهد آوَرَد* for *خَواهد آخِر بَرَسَر آوَرَد* and other combinations of the same nature.

THE second component part of the tense seems to be the ACCUSATIVE or OBJECT of the first, since there is little or no difference in point of sense between the words *زَید خَواهد آمد* and *زَید بَکر را خَواهد گشت*; *زَید آوَرَد خُود را می خَواهد* and *زَید بَکر را خَواهد گشت*; &c. The verb *خَواستن* may govern a sentence following the particle *که* *That*, as *زَی خَواستم که بَرَدَم*; &c. &c.

تَوَانستن TO BE ABLE.

THE application of this verb corresponds exactly with that of *خَواستن* as *دَتَوَانَم رَفْت* or *تَوَانِسْتَم رَفْت*; or *دَتَوَانَم که بِتَنج زَبَان بَرَنَسْتَم* &c. and it may be employed as an impersonal verb (*تَوَان*) deprived of the terminations that indicate person: as in the following lines of a poet whose name I do not at present remember.

اِسْلَام زِ اَنسَرافِ فِسرَنگ آوَرَدَن
 اَیْسَه چَین زِ مَنگ زَنگ آوَرَدَن
 اَز بَادِه رِیخِ سَیخِ بَرَنگ آوَرَدَن
 بَتَوَان تَوَان تَرابِه چَنگ آوَرَدَن

“ To find in EUROPE the Moohummudan faith: to find in ETHIOPIA the mirrors of CHINA: to inflame with wine the cheeks of the Shykh: (here significant of a pure devotee, who cannot be induced to taste of wine) all this may be done, but it is impossible to obtain the possession of thee.”

آرستن

توانستن To BE ABLE.

THIS verb indispensibly requires a negative particle, being never used in an affirmative sense ; and its application is chiefly restricted to poetry, although it is sometimes, (perhaps not unfrequently,) found to occur in prose. Example : گفتن باز من شد این جا مقیم :

" He said I cannot remain here ;" &c. In other respects, it is synonymous with the verb توانستن To BE ABLE, from which its application in the Language cannot be distinguished : as نیاز دارد که بیاید : نیازست آمدن : نیازست آمد &c. It cannot be used as an Impersonal verb ; like the word توان, and its application is comparatively of rare occurrence in the Language.

باید IT IS NECESSARY.

شاید IT IS PROPER.

THE verb شاید (and perhaps باید also) appears to have admitted, formerly, the inflexions of person, as in the following lines of NEZAUMEZ :

خواجسته مرا تو می شای
بشدگی ترا منم شایان

" You are the proper master for me, and I am worthy of being a servant to you."

BUT both verbs are now generally IMPERSONAL in the past and present tenses : as مرا باید رفت و مرا باید رفت و با بستی که می رستم و باید که بروم و باید که بروم &c. And they are both defective in the future tense. The adjectives شایسته and بایسته are synonymous with شایان already adduced : as امر بایسته کار

وکار شایسته and other examples of the same nature. The verb *شاید* is not unfrequently translated by the word *PERHAPS*: as *شاید که برود* "Perhaps he may go:" and though each verb is distinguished from the other by sense, yet either, in the common practice of the Persian Language, may be often observed to supply the place of both. They are sometimes employed in various senses; as *نباید که چون صبح گردد و سپید* "Let it not be, that when the morning dawns;" &c. the nature of which must be determined by the context, since they might otherwise admit of the common literal translation.

EITHER verb, having been expressed in one sentence, may be accurately omitted in another with which it is connected by the intervention of a copulative conjunction; as in the following example from *ABOOL FUZL*, in which the words *و دیگران را باعث شد* are obviously employed for *و دیگران را باعث باید شد*; and such omissions are of common occurrence in the Language.

اول در تهذیب اخلاق خود باید کوشید انگاه دیگران را باعث شد

"It is necessary, in the first place, to correct your own morals; and afterwards, to become the cause of amendment in others."

CONCLUSION.

It seems to me that all the preceding verbs are naturally *PERFECT*; having assumed the character of *IMPERFECT VERBS*, merely by the operation of that principle which I have already described under the term *مجرید*. The influence of *مجرید* is, indeed, frequently and optionally extended to a considerable number of Persian verbs, besides those already mentioned; such as
آمن

اَفْتَدَن : اَفْتَدَن : اَفْتَدَن : &c. inasmuch, that it would be hazardous to limit the number of IMPERFECT VERBS in this, or perhaps in any other Language. To explain by examples.

THE word اَفْتَدَن, as a perfect verb, signifies TO FALL; but it becomes IMPERFECT in the following example:

اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ الَّذِي سَوَّدَ مَسَاجِدَنَا اَفْتَدَن " Praised be God! all our labours have proved efficacious;" and so, indeed, does the verb PROVED, by which it is translated into the English Language. So, also, if I affirm that " JAMES fell sick;" the word FELL is an imperfect verb; because I mean to say, not that he *fell*; but merely that he was seized with a fit of sickness; or in other words, I mean to employ the verb FELL as a mere CONNECTIVE, deprived of the attributive character which is essential to its nature as a perfect verb. And on the other hand, if I affirm that " JAMES DIED poor," the verb DIED is here PERFECT, because I intend, in this case, to ascribe the sense of the infinitive (namely DEATH) to a given object or substantive noun. Let the word POOR be taken away, and it will still be true that " JAMES DIED;" but if, from the preceding examples, the predicate of the proposition shall be taken away, the sense of each will be altered or lost.

THIS I conceive to be the true test by which a PERFECT VERB may be always distinguished, even from itself, when employed as an IMPERFECT VERB to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition. For I have already said, in speaking of the example " He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," that it is not BEING OR EXISTENCE, but SAMENESS OR UNITY, or the possession of a nature unsusceptible of change, which is here doubtless ascribed to the DEITY; and so also, I conceive, that it is not FALLING but merely SICKNESS that we mean to ascribe to a given individual, when we affirm of him, that " He fell sick or ill." Yet we are at liberty to affirm of the DEITY that " he is or EXISTS the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;" in which case,

case, the word *is* becomes, immediately, a perfect verb. And we are also at liberty (for any thing I know to the contrary) to affirm of an individual that "He *FELL* sick;" or, in other words, that "He, being sick, fell or took to his bed;" &c. in which case *FELL*, also, becomes a perfect verb. The difference between them is therefore slight; and such as the mind will not recognize, otherwise than by adverting minutely to its own operations. It consists apparently in this; that every IMPERFECT VERB forms a connective, or middle term, or mark of predication, employed to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; whereas a PERFECT VERB is itself the predicate; and has, besides, the force of a connective, or middle term, or mark of predication.

CHAPTER THIRD.

اَفْعَالٌ تَامَةٌ OR PERFECT VERBS.

A PERFECT verb has already been defined to be a word which indicates the union of its own infinitive with a given object or substantive noun, in such a manner as to form a perfect sentence, whether conveying an assertion or not: as "JAMES sleepeth," or "Does he sleep?" "JOHN readeth," or "Does he read?" &c.

PERFECT verbs are TRANSITIVE OR NEUTER ; (اَفْعَالٌ مُشَبَّهَةٌ)
ACTIVE OR PASSIVE ; (مَرْفُوعٌ وَنَحْوُهُ) &c. and all verbs are inflected into the PAST, PRESENT and FUTURE TENSES, by means of which they indicate the occurrence of a given event in past, present, or future time. If therefore we have occasion to speak of a past (and so also of a present or future event,) we shall naturally employ the past tense of the verb: ("JAMES died yesterday;"

yesterday;" "JAMES dined two hours ago;" &c.) and this is done on so plain a principle, as to admit of no illustration by the rules of grammar.

BUT the idiom of the Persian language authorises, in certain cases, the substitution of one tense for another; and so considered, the application of TENSES will be admitted to form a reasonable object of Grammatical research. My enquiries on the subject have, however, been less fruitful of useful information than at first I had reason to believe they would be; but they have not therefore been wholly unsuccessful, and I have thought it right to insert them here, in the belief that the partial disappointment of my expectations has been chiefly occasioned by the sterility of the subject, which is more promising in appearance than it will be found in reality, by those, who, like myself, may have occasion, hereafter, to investigate the truth.

APPLICATION OF TENSES.

SECTION FIRST.

ماضی OR SIMPLE PRETERITE.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE PAST TENSE may be optionally, and is, in fact, not unfrequently employed to supply the place of the AORIST, in a given sentence comprising a **مَشْرُط** OF CONDITIONAL MEMBER, and the **جَزَاء** OF CONSEQUENCE flowing from the **مَشْرُط**. In this case, the past tense may accurately occur in both, or in either member of the sentence. Examples:
 اگر نمی رسیدی (اگر نرسی) انتظارت خواهد کشت
 "If you do not arrive (by such a time) the languor of expectation will kill me;"
 اگر امروز به خلق رحم کنی فردا مردم شری (مردم خواهی شد)
 "If you are merciful to others to-day, yourself will be

received into mercy to morrow ; ” *اگر ز قسبتی بر دی و اگر خوشی مر دی*

“ If you go on, you are safe; but if you sleep, you die.”

So, also, in the following lines of NEZAUMEE:

نه هشتاد و نه و اگر در زبیدی بساستی که از دوزان سیدی

“ If you attain the age of eighty or ninety, many are the wocs that will fall to your lot.”

THESE lines, as they stand in Persian, might be addressed to a youth of sixteen, with as much propriety as to an old man of ninety; from which it follows plainly, that the past is here used for the future tense of the verb.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE past may supercede the future tense of a verb in both members, or in either member of a sentence comprising a relative pronoun. Examples:

هر که علم شد بگو و مکرّم بند نشاید که زند درم (علم شود)

“ He who would obtain celebrity for his bounty, must not put his money under lock and key.” *هر که در خورش اوب نکند*

“ He who is untaught or vicious in his youth, is not likely to be a virtuous man.” *و هر که زگی صلاح از و برخواست (بر خیرد)*

هر که با یو لا د باز و بجز کرد (ببخشد) سایه کشی خود را رنج کرد (رنج کند)

“ He who wrestles with a man stronger than himself must go to the wall; ” &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE past may supercede the future tense of the verb in the statement of a permanent proposition, believed by the speaker to be of certain occurrence. Thus an immolated victim of tyranny, is supposed by SAADEE to speak of his murderer in the following terms:

و می پیش بر من ریاست نراند
حقّو بت بر و نمایاست براند (یعنی مانده است و نخواهد ماند)

“ His punishment of me was over in a moment, but the evil consequences

consequences of guilt will for ever continue to pursue him."

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE past is often found to supercede the future tense of a verb in stating the consequence of obedience to a command expressed by means of a verb in the imperative mode. In this case, the consequence is commonly stated for the purpose of inciting immediate obedience, and the verb is put into the past tense, in order to indicate the rapidity or certainty with which the effect will flow from the cause. Examples :

“ Enjoy the goods of fortune, and contribute to relieve the wants of others, for in that case, your reward is happiness here and hereafter.”

تُو ز ا ن جَا آئِدِی اِیْن جَا دُو یَدِی
اَزِیْن جَا دُرُکْدَر کَا تَجَا رُ سِیْدِی (خوای رسید)

“ Thence have you come (namely, from the world of spirits,) and here (to this world) you have directed your flight; shake off the propensities of mortal flesh, and there (which is your home) you will arrive once more.” &c.*

THE

* The words *اِیْن جَا* and *اَنْ جَا*, in the mouth of a Soofee poet, must be generally translated by this world and the next; or by this world and the world of spirits; yet there is nothing to prevent a true Soofee from aspiring to the bliss of the next world even before he has “ shuffled off this mortal coil.”

The celebrated MOOLLA JELAUL has expressed this sentiment in the clearest language; affirming in so many words, that it is a matter of little importance whether a true Soofee shall be living or dead; since the use of his corporal faculties will not prevent (though it must impede in a certain degree) his enjoyment of the beatific vision, from which he will reap in *this world* the same bliss which others expect in the *next*.

The passage in question contains a clear, though concise view of the nature of the arguments employed by the Soofees; and as a matter of curiosity, the reader may not be displeased with its insertion here.

اَر سَلَا بِلِسْ اِذَا رُفْلِبِلِسْ نَفْسِی کُنْدِ کِه چِرْ هَی مَحَلَّتْ رَا بَا سَم دِکِرِ اَنْبِیَام
دَوَا شَبِ نَام نَوَانْدِ بُوْدَنَا چِرْ هَی مَشَا کَلِی هِم دِکِرِ مَشَا کَلِی بَا شَبْدِ دُرُ شَرَحِ اِنْ
اِبْشَان

R U L E F I F T H.

The past may supercede the future tense of a verb in stating a proposition, the object of which is to deny the importance of a given action, considered with reference to its performance

گفته اند که چون جوهر بسیط متشاکل باشند و یکدیگر مشتاق هیرانه میان ایشان
 نایلنی روحانی و اتحادی منوی حاصل شود و تباین مرفیع گردد در تباین از لوازم
 هذبات است و در مادیات این نوع ناهت نتواند و تلاقی ایشان بذوات
 و حقایق منصوص نباشد بل که به نباتات و سلوح تواند بود و این تلاقی بدو بر آن
 اتصال نرسد و چون جوهر بسیط که نفس انسانی است از که در ایت جهانی
 پاک گردد و محبت لذات طبعی از دمحشود بحکیم مناسبت بمعالم قدس مجرب
 شود و بنظر بصیرت مشاهد جمال حقیقی نماید و پروانه صفت هستی خود را در انوار
 قاهره تجلیات الهی محو گرداند و به مقام وحدت که نهایت مقامات است برسد
 و این مرتبه حق البقیع است و صاحب آن مرتبه را تعلق میدن و بگردان زبانه
 فرقی نباشد بر استعمال قوای بدنی او را از فکر به جمال حقیقی باز ندارد و وسع ادانی
 که دیگران را در نشاء اخروی مرقب است این را در بین نشاء حاصل باشد
 امروز در ان کوشش که بینا باشی جراتی جمال آن دل آرا باشی
 قمرت بادا چه کو دکان در شب عید ناچند با شتلا و نسر داباشی
 لیکن بعد از مفارقت کتی لذت ادا صفا باشد هر چند در بین نشاء نبود بصیرت

mance or otherwise. Example: **آئری یا نیا ئری هر دو بر آبر است**
 "It is a matter of no importance whether you come or not;"
 or in the Aorist: **بیائی به و نیائی به** "What does it signify
 whether you come or not?" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE past is generally preferred to the future tense of the verb, in stating the purport of an order which has been obeyed; and in this case, the phrase significant of the thing ordered, most commonly follows the verb **فرمود** or **گفت** &c. Examples: **مَلِكٌ فَرَمُو د نَا اَسْأَدَ رَا حَلَّتْ وَفَرَمَتْ دَاوُدُ**
 "The King gave orders to reward the master with an honorary robe and other marks of his favor, and these orders were obeyed accordingly;" or more literally, "The

از دقایق اما وصفات مشاده و حدت ذات نماید فاما حالی از شوب ثوبت
 که مقتضای نش معلقی است تواند بود و شهود نام بی دغدغه مزاحمت و قبیان
 جز در خلوت خانه تجرد منبر کرد و بنا برین همیشه منتظر و مترصد رفیع این حجاب
 و کشف این نقاب بوده زبان حال فحوائی این مقال مترنم دارد
 حجاب برسد همان می شود غبار تنم خوشامدی که اذان جره پرده برافکنم
 چنین قفس نرزی من خوش الحان است و دم بگلشن رضوان که مرغ آن تنم
 و این محبت نهایت مراتب عشق است و کمال مطلق و ذر و ده مقامات
 و اصلا و غایت مراتب کمالان است

عشق است هر چه هست بگفیم و گفته اند

عشقت بوصول دوست رساند بقرب راست

King issued orders, and so they *bestowed* on the master an honorary robe." We are thus at once informed, that the orders were issued, and also obeyed; whereas the use of the Aorist (نَامَدَ فَرْمُودَ و نَامَدَ دَرِ اَخْلَاصَت و بَعَثَ و بَعَثَ) would leave it doubtful whether the king's orders were obeyed or not. So, also, (فَرَايَشَ اِدَمَبَارَ اَكْفَشَت نَا فَرِيَشَ زَمَرُ دِينَ بَكْتَرُ و " He (the DEITY) issued his command to the morning breeze, which *spread* accordingly the verdant carpet of the earth;" و وَايَا اَبْرَهَرِ اَرَمِي رَا فَرْمُودَ تَابَاتِ تَابَاتِ رَا دَرُ تَهْرُزِ مِينَ بَهْرُ و " And sent forth his mandates to the nurse of the vernal clouds, which (nurse) *cherished* accordingly, the infant herbs of the spring in the cradle of the earth;" &c. The use of the Aorist, though certainly optional, would be much less elegant than that of the preterite in all these examples.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

GENERAL opinions ought to result from the observation of facts; and whether we state a general opinion, or the facts on which an opinion is founded, the effect is the same in either case. An Englishman will commonly state the opinion, as " Force cannot cope with fortune;" and a Persian will be often disposed to state the facts on which the opinion is founded; as " The strong have been generally foiled in the contest with fortune;" &c. This, therefore, is a case in which the past may be said to supercede the future tense of the verb. Example:

کُزِ بِنِ . سَ بَه کُنْجِ بَشَنِم جُو مُوَرِ کِه رُو زِ مِ نَخُورَ وَ نَدِرِ بِلَانِ بَرُورِ

" Henceforward I shall retire and dwell in a corner, like the ant; for even the elephant (which is the strongest of all animals) cannot master (has not mastered) his fortune by force."

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE prophetic denunciation of a future event will be often expressed in the past tense, in order to indicate the certainty of

its

its occurrence. Example : کافر امروز اگرچه خوش است لیکن فردا است که طوق لغت بر گردن کشیده و با انواع عذاب گیرفتار گردد.
 " The infidel, however happy to-day, will be encircled to-morrow by a collar of curses, and will suffer miseries of every description."

R U L E N I N T H.

If, by the effect of a relative pronoun or otherwise, the past tense of a given verb shall assume the sense of the future tense; then every other verb in the past tense, which is connected with it by means of conjunctions, &c. will also assume a future sense. Examples : هر که آمد به ما رنی نو ساخت
 " Whoever enters into this world, builds for himself a new habitation;" "و متبرک و متبرک بدین گری پرده است" which he quits (at his death) and leaves to another;" "و آن و اگر بخت هم چنان نویسی"
 " His successor is guilty of the same folly;"
 "But nobody continues permanently to enjoy the habitation." &c.

C O N C L U S I O N.

It seems to me that most of the preceding rules have their basis in the following principle, to which I have already had occasion to advert; namely, that the occurrence of a future event is naturally a matter of great uncertainty, and generally speaking, will be so considered if expressed by the future tense of the verb. Past events having already occurred, are subject to no uncertainty at all:

" Not heaven itself upon the past has power,

" What has been has been! and I have had my hour."

And hence it happens, that a Persian, having occasion to speak of a future event which he believes to be of certain occurrence,

tence, will naturally enough employ the past tense of the verb, by the use of which he means to apprise his auditor that "the occurrence of the event, though still future, is in his opinion not less certain than if it were past."

SECTION SECOND.

مَابَضِیِ اِسْتِمْرَارِی OR THE CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE.

THE principles that regulate the application of this tense to the purposes of speech are of a nature so difficult, that they have baffled all my endeavours to place the subject in a clear point of view. I shall therefore furnish the reader with such imperfect lights as I myself have been able to obtain; trusting that the result of his own reflexions may enable him to supply whatever is wanting to the more perfect elucidation of this intricate subject.

THE continuative preterite is formed from the simple past tense of the verb by prefixing the particles *می* or *می*; as *می کردم* or *می رفتی*; &c. It may be also formed in the first and third persons singular, and in the third person plural, by adding to the simple preterite the letter *ی*; as *می کردی*; *می رفتی*; &c. The following are all the rules that I have been able to collect, regarding its use and application to the purposes of speech.

R U L E F I R S T.

It denotes the continued operation of the sense of a given verb during some definite or indefinite period of past time, and is therefore termed the continuative preterite. Examples: *آن را نگاه می داشتم* "I continued to preserve it;" *به ملاقات فلان می رفتم* "I was in the habit of visiting such a person

person (every now and then);" &c. The reader will observe that there is an obvious difference in the sense of the term *استمرار*, or CONTINUATION, as applicable to each of the preceding examples. The action of the verb "To preserve," is continued without interruption of any kind; whereas that of the verb "To visit," is continued by its repetition at certain intervals. It may be inferred, therefore, that the nature of the continuative sense will vary with that of the action to which it is imputed.

R U L E S E C O N D.

IT indicates the state of its own agent at some specific period of past time, either expressed or left undefined.

Examples: "و دوش چون طاموس می نازیدم اندر باغ و شل" I was strutting last night like the peacock, in the garden of union"

(with my beloved mistress;) "و زنجیرش او کتاب شاه نامه می خواندند" (that is to say, on a certain specific occasion;) &c.

R U L E T H I R D:

IT forms a sort of OPTATIVE mode of the verb; being generally employed to indicate the wishes of the speaker, with reference to some definite or indefinite period of past time.

Example: "کاشش که زنده بودی" "Would that ZYDE had been alive;" or "Would that ZYDE were now alive;" (which is no longer possible;) "چه بودی از دل آن ماه رستم بان بودی" "How de-

lightful! if the heart of that beautiful woman had been favorable; or were now favorable to me;" (an event which may possibly still occur.) In every example of this kind, there is properly speaking a reference to past time; yet this tense of the verb, when so used, will coalesce with the word اکنون Now, significant of present time; (as "کاشش که زنده اکنون بودی" "Would

that ZYDE were now alive,") on a principle which I do not perfectly understand. I shall furnish one more example, with a view to excite the readers attention to the optative application of this singular tense.

کاش کان روز که در پای تو شتر خا بر آجل
 دست گزینی بر دی رنج هلاکم بر سر
 تا درین روز جهان بی تو نگیرد چشمت
 این منم بر سر غاب تو که خاکم بر سر
 سعدی

"O THAT fortune *had* unsheathed against me the sword of destruction, on the day when your foot was pierced by the thorn of death! For then *would* my eyes have been spared the pain of beholding the world deprived of thy presence: Alas! on thy grave I stand, heaping on my head the dust of lamentation and grief."

R U L E F O U R T H.

THIS tense will be almost invariably employed to indicate past time, in both members of a sentence comprising a **شَرَط** or CONDITIONAL MEMBER; and the **جَزَا** or CONSEQUENCE flowing from the **شَرَط**. As when we say in English "If JAMES had been virtuous, he would have abstained from the commission of such and such crimes;" or to express the same sentiment in other words, "He was *not* virtuous, and therefore *committed* the crimes in question." In this point of view, each verb, in its negative form, may be said to possess an affirmative sense; and vice versa. Examples:

اگر بزار جان می داشتم و ز بی جانان شد ای تو دم

"Had.

" Had I possessed (or did I possess) a thousand lives, I would have sacrificed (or would sacrifice) them all for my beloved."

نہ انا اگر نہ مہدیدی چہ بین و انا نہ می شدم
 Had I not seen you, I should have been (or should be) less deeply in love than now I am."
 مرا صبری اگر بودی نکتہ بی کار من مشکیل
 Had I possessed (or did I possess) patience, I should have been (or should be) less miserable than now I am."

خیال اگر نشدی سیر آب و بندہ من
 ہزار ہستہ بہ ہر گوشہ روان بودی

" Had not the image of my beloved (which fills my eye), served (or did it not serve) as a mound to restrain my tears, they would have gushed out (or would gush out) into a thousand fountains (rapidly) flowing in every direction."

It is to be observed however, that the use of this tense in the ۱st, or second member of the sentence, may be sometimes elegantly superceded by the pluperfect: as in the following example from the ANWAARÉ SOOHYLEE.

اگر تھم دور تھا فطرت تو اقبال تھو دمی این جاندار مشفق و دوست
 مہربان تو شبنان از خون تو مالامال ساختہ بود (یعنی می ساخت)

" Had I delayed for an instant to provide for your safety, this kind and friendly animal *had stained* (would have stained) the bed-chamber with your blood."

THE use of the pluperfect tense , ساختہ , seems here to denote that the event stated, namely, the shedding of the blood of the party addressed, would have been *finished* or *over* before

fore the time of speaking; a circumstance which would be left uncertain, if we employ instead of it the tense *ساخت*.

CONCLUSION.

I THINK it necessary to mark, by a few observations, the importance of the fourth and last rule for the application of the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE. By that rule, we are informed that the continuative preterite must be generally employed in both members of a conditional sentence, having a reference to past time; and though the rule is open to certain exceptions, as in the example drawn from the ANWAURE' SOOHYLEE, it may be truly affirmed that those exceptions are of rare occurrence, and that the governing principle is the same in them all. The simple preterite or the pluperfect are probably the only tenses by which, in such cases, the continuative preterite can be superseded; and that only in the 1st or second member of the sentence, as in the example already adduced.

It has been stated however in the fourth rule, that each verb, in its negative form, may be said to possess an affirmative sense; and vice versa; as when we affirm of an individual that "If he had done his duty, the mischief in question might have been avoided;" an assertion obviously equivalent to the statement of an opinion, that "He has *not* done his duty, and that therefore the mischief has *not* been avoided." This is most probably the true test by which to regulate the application of the continuative preterite; for if the sentence cannot be so transposed, the continuative preterite will not be employed. To explain by an example.

WE may affirm of an individual that "If he committed the crime laid to his charge, he merited (or did merit) the punishment by which it may have been followed," a sentiment by no means equivalent to the statement of an opinion that "He did *not* commit the crime laid to his charge, and therefore did

did *not* merit the punishment by which it was followed." On the contrary, no opinion is here passed with regard to the guilt or innocence of the accused party; we merely affirm, that the crime, if committed, was such in its own nature, as to merit the punishment inflicted on him; but as to the guilt or innocence of the sufferer, that is a question on which, in the absence of evidence, we do not presume to offer an opinion.

In this case, the continuative preterite will not be employed; and the verb, in the first member of the sentence, must be put into the doubtful, or simple, or compound preterite, as the nature of the case may happen to require. Examples : اگر گناه از دست او صادر شده "If the crime has been committed by him", or "Should the crime have been committed by him;" سزاوار قتل باشد or سزاوار قتل است "He is worthy, or must be worthy of the punishment of death;" &c. It is remarkable that the words سزاوار قتل بود "He *was* worthy of Death," would be here inaccurate, I know not precisely for what reason, connected with the sense of اگر. If we substitute for اگر, the words در صورتی که گناه از دست او صادر شد "Supposing the crime was committed by him;" سزاوار قتل بود "He *was* worthy of Death;" the word بود will then be accurate, and may be employed as occasion requires. I now proceed to consider the use and application of the AORIST to the purposes of speech.

SECTION THIRD.

مضارع OR AORIST.

THE AORIST is defined to be that tense of a verb which is com-

mon to FUTURE and PRESENT time; being nevertheless susceptible of restriction to either, by means of what is termed a **قَرَبْنَه**, either verbal or flowing from the sense. Thus the word **مِي**, prefixed to the Aorist, will commonly indicate PRESENT TIME; as **مِي گِرَنِم**; **مِي رَوَم**; **مِي مِرَم** &c. and this therefore is a **قَرَبْنَه** **لَفْظِي** OR VERBAL KŪREENA, not a KŪREENA flowing from the sense.

BUT in the absence of **مِي**, or any other verbal **قَرَبْنَه**, present time may yet be often inferred from the context; as **مِي دَارَد** (for **مِي دَارَد**) "The Hooma is therefore superior to all other Birds;" &c. And this inference, to which we are led by the sense of the sentence, is commonly termed a **قَرَبْنَه** **مَعْنَوِي**, that is to say, "a KŪreena flowing from the sense." The term **قَرَبْنَه**, in its utmost latitude, is consequently applicable to any kind of inference, either verbally expressed or gathered from the context; and this term, which cannot be easily translated into English, is of common occurrence in the books of Arabic and Persian Grammar.

THE term **مُضَارِع** literally signifies "SIMILAR," and is applied to the Aorist, because that tense of a verb is generally supposed to resemble a noun. For a generic noun naturally applicable to many objects, may be so restricted, either by means of an Article or otherwise, as to indicate the name of an individual object; and the Aorist, also, may be so restricted by means of a verbal **قَرَبْنَه** or otherwise, as to denote *one* only of those times (namely, present and future time,) to *both* of which it was originally applicable.

IN

IN the absence of any verbal **فَرِيشَه**, the Persian AORIST most commonly indicates future time; and is generally restricted to present time by means of the particles **می** and **می**; as **می بینم، و می ریزم**, "I see, and yet search I select, and yet reject;" &c. But present time, in the strict and proper sense of the term, is known to be a mere fiction of the mind; first, because all time exists in succession; and secondly, because the parts of a moment are consequently past and future with reference to each other, as certainly as those of a year. Any portion of past and future time may nevertheless be assumed as present; as when we speak of "the present day;" "the present week;" "the present century;" &c. and hence it happens that present time, according to the Grammatical acceptation of the term, commonly indicates that extended portion of time which is coeval with the action of a given verb.

IT is the object of the following rules to illustrate the application of the Aorist, whether restricted or not by the particles **می** or **می**; that is to say, whether it shall form the AORIST properly so called, or what has been termed the **حال** or PRESENT TENSE of the verb.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE AORIST, restricted by the particles **می** or **می**, is commonly employed to indicate present time: as

بِهَمی خندَم از ظفِ بَر و این پاک
که مظلوم رَقِسم نه غلامِ بَخاک

"I smile and rejoice in the favor of God, who has permitted me to die the victim, not the agent of tyranny." And like the present tense in every other Language, it may, in this case, be employed in the statement of those propositions which are considered

considered by the mind as generally true, whether they are presently true or not. Example: *برقعه عالم بمی تابد شبین*
 "The star CANOPUS shines on all the world;" &c. The Aorist, unrestricted by the particles *می* or *بمی*, is also employed (though less frequently) in the statement of such propositions. Example:

*باران بر دَر لَطائِبِ طَبَقِشِ عِلَافِ نِیست
 دَر باغِ اَلرُّویدِ دَر سُورَه جُومِ خَس*

"The kindly rains impartially moisten every soil, yet the garden alone produces flowers, (*دَر باغِ اَلرُّویدِ*) and weeds spring up in barren land."

R U L E S E C O N D.

In the conversation of the Persians, though seldom perhaps in written composition, the present is often found to supercede the past tense of the verb, in the statement of those propositions which, though past in point of fact, are recalled by the memory as if they were present. Example:

*دی شب گذرم نَرَدِ دُوسِی اُفتِ دَر آنجا عجب بَرزِی می بَیستم
 و طَرَقِ نَمَاشایی می کنم*

"Last night I went to the house of a friend, and there saw (see) a delightful assembly, and enjoyed (enjoy) a most pleasing spectacle;" &c. Of this nature are the Examples: *مُتَنَفِّحِ چَیْنِ کَوید* "The writer thus observes;"

پَیْغَمْبَرِ پَنانِ قَرمی دَهر "The prophet informs (or has informed) us;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE present is often found to supercede the future tense of a verb, in the prophetic statement of a given proposition, which, though future, is nevertheless deemed to be of certain occurrence. Example:

نَدَد

نقد و جنس باله اندوخته اش در دو سه روز تاراج تاوانات
می رود (خدا می راند)

"The money and property which he has accumulated in the course of many years, will be soon snatched away by the hand of misfortune."

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE PRESENT is often found to supercede the FUTURE tense of a verb in the statement of two propositions, connected together by means of the particle *یا*. Or. Example :

یا می بینم از تو خط بندد پروری یا خط بندگی ترا پاره می کنم (پاره خواهم کرد)

"I shall either obtain from you an order to reward my services, or I will tear in pieces the lines of my devotion to you."

R U L E F I F T H.

THE PRESENT is often found to supercede the FUTURE tense of the verb in both members, or in either member of a CONDITIONAL SENTENCE, comprising a *شرط* and a *جسرا*. Examples :

گرم چو خاک ز زمین خوار می گئی شمس ست
"If you treat (or shall treat) me with ignominy like the dust of the earth, I can bear it with ease."

خبیث را چو نیک کنی و برخوازی بد و لذت تو بنگه می کند بآبازی
"When you confer favors on the vicious man, he looks only to participate in your wealth."

مگر نمی بینم ز رخسار می مبسمم از شادی وصل

"If I see her face, I die with joy of her preference;" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE PRESENT is often found to supercede the FUTURE tense of the verb in what is termed *مقام توفیق*; that is to say, a

sentence consisting of two members governed by the words *When* or *While*; &c. Example:

وَقَدْ بَرَّئَايَ نَوَازِشِ حَاصِلِ مِي گَرَدَدَ كِه مَدَّعَايِ مَن اَز تُو نَبَزِ حَاصِلِ گَرَدَدَ
 "Then only you *will* obtain your desire from me, *when* I shall obtain my desire from you;" &c. And in the case of a Relative Pronoun: as کَا نَبَزِ جَنَمِ آ رَدَ بَخُونِ نَبَزِ بَشَسِ بَا زِي مِي كَنَدَ
 "For he who fights (shall fight,) sports (or will sport) with his own life."

R U L E S E V E N T H.

THE use of one verb in the PRESENT tense will often furnish a **قَرِيبَ**, by which another verb in the AORIST will be restricted to present time; and in this case either verb may take precedence of the other in the order of speech. Examples:

تُو خَلَقِ رَا بَرِ بَرِشَانِ مِي رَنِي مَگَرِ سَبَرِ بَا دُشْمَانِي نَدَارِي (نَه مَبْدَارِي)
 "Why do you treat mankind with tyranny? apparently you have no desire to reign."
 بِي رَا بَدَّ شَتِ اَنَقَلَدَ تُو. كَنَدَ (مِي اَنَقَلَدَ)
 "He loads some with mountains of treasure;
 "And bestows on them uncounted guins."

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE AORIST as well as the PRESENT tense is often employed to indicate the present state of its own agent, as opposed to the condition of the same agent at any former period of time. Example: "I have little money and many children."
 كَفَا اَتَدَك دَارَم و عِيَالِ بَشَار (مِي دَارَم)

R U L E N I N T H.

THE AORIST notwithstanding the opposite opinion of certain Grammarians) is restricted to future time by means of the particles **نَه** or **بِه**. Examples: "I will go;" "I will
 will

will not go"; &c. And by means of any word significant of future time; as *قَدْ ارَوم* "I will go to morrow;" &c.

R U L E T E N T H.

IN a conditional sentence comprising a *شَرْط* and a *جَزَا*, the AORIST will be generally found to indicate future as opposed to present time. Example: *اگر فرمانی اُو را خاموش کنم* "If you give me orders, I will put him to silence." And the same rule is generally applicable to any sentence comprising a Relative Pronoun. Example: *هر که خیانت ورزد* "He who is guilty of fraud, *دشمن از حساب برآورد* will tremble when he comes to give in his account." Or to any sentence following the words *Wenn*, or *While*; &c. as *تا رنج نسبری گنج بر نداری* (تو ای برو داشت) "While you practise no industry, you will acquire no treasure."

R U L E E L E V E N T H.

THE use of an interrogative pronoun will generally restrict the AORIST to future time. Example: *بیش که بزم زدشت فریاد* "To whom shall I complain of your intention against me." And the same effect will follow the use of an oath. Example: *بهر شتر عظیم* *و صحبت قدیم که دم بر نیارم و قدم بر نذارم مگر آنکه که سخن گفته شود* "I swear by God, and by our ancient friendship, that I will not breathe, or move a step from hence, until you have spoken."

R U L E T W E L F T H.

THE AORIST, following a verb in the IMPERATIVE MODE, will be generally restricted to future time. Example :-

بخد آن بیش و بید که بی مویشی آورد "Give him wine enough to bring

bring on intoxication;" &c. And so also, in the expression of our prayers, hopes, fears, &c. Examples: خدا کند که ز من عیش و مست بردارد؛

"God grant that LOVE may cease to torture me;"

اُمید دارم که در محبت صالحان تربیت پذیرد "I hope that, in the society of the virtuous, he may (or will) be formed to virtue."

R U L E T H I R T E E N T H.

THE AORIST is sometimes found to supersede the CONTINUATIVE PAST tense of the verb, on a principle which I do not clearly understand. Example:

اگر فرضاً در جمع کردن مال هیچ گونه مفید جز حساب دادن و مدتی
و و در و در آفتاب طاقت نگذازد و جز ایستادن نه بودی
مرو خردمند بایستی که برای همان مقدار دست تلاش پیوسته
در آستین مانش کشیده دارد (کشیده می داشت) رفیع و اعظ

"If the accumulation of property were followed by no evil but that of the necessity of giving an account, at the great day of judgment, of the uses to which it has been applied, it would yet be incumbent on a wise man to refrain from the acquisition of more than a competence."

C O N C L U S I O N.

I AM somewhat ashamed of the insignificant nature of these rules, and shall therefore here put an end to the present Section of this Chapter, which might yet be extended by the insertion of others of the same description. Adverting to the nature of the PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE tenses of a Persian verb, it may, I believe, be accurately affirmed that the two former will often supply the place of the latter, according to the following principle: namely, because it seems to be a natural operation of the mind to represent as present, or even as

past,

past, a given event which, though future, is nevertheless deemed to be of certain occurrence. The present may also supply the place of the past tense, whenever the speaker is disposed, by the aid of imagination, to recal the memory of former occurrences, and place them, as it were, before the eyes of his auditor: as "Now the army rush (rushed) to the breach," and other examples of the same nature. And on the contrary, I know of no principle by which the past and present tense of a verb can be accurately superseded by the future tense; but the Aorist is a present, as well as a future tense of the verb, and may, therefore, be occasionally observed to supply the place of its past tenses. I now proceed to consider the nature of the IMPERATIVE MODE.

SECTION FOURTH.

أَمْرٌ OR THE IMPERATIVE MODE.

THE IMPERATIVE is defined to be that form of the verb, by which "we require the performance or sufferance of an action, by a given object or substantive noun;" as بِحَوَابٍ "Sleep thou;" بِرَن "Strike thou;" زِدْهُ شَوْ "Be thou struck;" &c. It is properly IMPERATIVE when addressed to an inferior; and has been termed SOLICITIVE (عَرَضٌ وَإِثْنَائِي) when addressed to an equal, and PRECATIVE (رُجَا) when addressed to the DEITY, or to those who are higher in rank than ourselves.

It is rhetorically employed for various purposes; as that of expressing our assent to the performance of a given action: بِتَعْدِ إِعْجَابِ إِيْنِ كَارِ بِرُو "Go (if you please) after the completion of this affair;" or of conveying censure: as بِمَرْجُوْ خَوَابِيْ كُنْ "Do what you please," addressed to a man who has refused to listen

ten to our admonitions: or of indicating the nature of our own wishes: as **اَيُّ شَيْءٍ دُرِّازِ شَوْكِه يَارُم دُرِّ آخُونِشِ است** "Extend, O NIGHT, the period of your duration, for now my mistress is strained to my bosom;" &c. The rhetorical application of the Imperative mode is obviously common to every language, and does not therefore stand in need of any illustration.

As this form of the verb is necessarily referable to future time, so it requires generally the use of the particle *يَرْوُ* (يَرْوُ &c.) which is seldom omitted, except in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it.

THE AORIST, or the FUTURE TENSE of the verb is sometimes found to supercede the Imperative; as

“Perform (or you will perform) the duty of thanksgiving to God,” and vice versa; as
 بِارِعِيَّتِ مُلْكُكُمْ وَازْجَنِبْهُمْ اِيْمَنُ نَشِئْتُمْ (نَحْوِ اِي نَشِئْتُمْ)
 “Treat your subjects kindly, and fear not (you need not fear) the hostile designs of your enemy;” &c.

THE IMPERATIVE OF DURATION (اَمْرٌ مُشْتَبِرٌ) is formed, in the second person singular, by prefixing می or می to the simple Imperative; as می رَو or می کن; می کن or می کن; &c. Examples: "Graze on the banks of the streams and fountains;" بِبَرَسْ سَیْزِش دُمایِ گُونی "And pray for his prosperity; &c. Indeed the particle می or می seems to be accurately applicable to *all* the tenses and forms of a Persian verb; as می کرده باشم; می کرده بودم; می کرده ام; می کرده بودم; می کنم; می کن; &c. &c. The Imperative of duration is also formed.

formed, through all its inflexions, by combining the past Active participle with the auxiliary باشم; as گزده باشم; گزده باشی; گزده باشد; &c. And the nature of the combination is perfectly obvious, since the past active participle must be here considered as the حال, employed to describe the state of the AGENT, or nominative to the verb; as مان کارکنان باشی, or in other words, "Continue in the state of performing such an action;" &c.

THE Imperative گو *Speak*, is often prefixed to another Imperative; as گو آن سنگ همان جا باش "Let the stone remain where it is," a form of construction otherwise remarkable, since the Imperative باش ought, apparently, to have assumed the form of the third person singular, (گو آن سنگ همان جا باشد) which is also accurate, though, in this and other similar examples, often superseded by the second person, for reasons which I do not clearly understand. The word گو may also supply, occasionally, the place of اگرچه *although*; as گو منت خاک ما هم بر باد رفته باشد "Even though my body of clay may have been (or may be) destroyed;" &c.

THE Imperative خواه *Wish*, is also idiomatically employed to indicate the equality or deny the difference between two opposite propositions, considered with reference to the occurrence of either; and in this case it must be repeated in the sentence, and will be generally translated by "Whether or not;" as آنچه بنیادی ندارد خواه است و خواه نیست "That which has no solid foundation, it signifies nothing whether it exists or not;" &c. It is possible that other Imperatives may be idiomatically employed for various purposes which do not at present occur to my recollection; and if so, they must be left to the acquisition of practical study. The Imperative یا, which is employed in prayer, may be sometimes observed to assume

assume the form بادوی, in the second person singular; as

عشمر با دت که هست بخت بار
بادوی از عشمر و بخت بر خود دار

" May your life endure, for your fortune is prosperous; may you reap the fruits of life and glory!" &c.

THE Imperative is very commonly followed by a sentence significant of the motive proposed to incite obedience; as " Read that you may learn," &c. and this sentence is known to Grammarians by the term جواب امر " The answer to the verb in the Imperative mode." In the Persian language, it generally follows the particles تا, or که, or تا که, or more rarely تا که تا as

ز ابر از کوه جزر ندان به سلامت بگذر
تا خرابست نمکند عجبست بدنامی چند حافظ

" Leave in peace the haunts of the dissolute, O thou (pure and spotless) devotee! that so (تا, or که, or تا که, or که تا) the society of the vicious may not contaminate the (boasted) purity of your sacred character." There is nevertheless a difference of sense between تا and که, the nature of which will soon be explained.

THE Imperative is sometimes omitted in speech; as ائمی دوستان مددی فرمایید ائمی دوستان مددی " Assistance, O my friends!" and sometimes the answer is prefixed to the Imperative mode: as

تا بر دیش از خسته غبار می نه کشید
ائمی سبیل سه شنگ از عقب نامه روان باش حافظ

" O! that my tears would follow my letter, and serve to allay the dust of her anger!" Or the answer may follow the Imperative, after the intervention of another sentence: as

صورت

صوفی بیباک آیت صاف ست جام را
نا بستری مقامی نمی لعل فام را عایظ

"Come, O SOOFEZ! for the glass is clear; and behold the lustre of the ruby colored wine."

نهی, OR THE PROHIBITIVE.

THE PROHIBITIVE is formed from the IMPERATIVE, in the second persons singular and plural by prefixing the letter

ن as نَسَبْ : نَسَبْ : and elsewhere by means of the letter ن as نَسَبْ : نَسَبْ : &c. It demands that

the party addressed shall *desist* from the performance or sufferance of a given action: as نَحْرَابْ "Do not thou sleep;"

مَزْنْ "Do not thou beat;" زَدَدْ شُوْ "Be not thou beaten;"

&c.

THE answer to the PROHIBITIVE (جواب نهی) is a sentence of the same nature with the جواب امر which has been just now explained; and generally follows the particle تا, which is itself commonly followed by a negative particle:

as بَرِّعْظَنَنْتْ مَلِیْبِرَنْتْ تَرَانَنْتْ مَلِیْبِرَنْتْ "Do not treat the people harshly, that they may not injure you." There are indeed but two cases, so far as I have been able to observe, in which the particle تا, after the نهی, may be accurately followed by an affirmative sentence: namely,

first, when the verb is prohibitive by its own signification: as مَانِعْ مَشُوْتْ بَدَرْ رُوْمْ "Do not hinder me from going out;" and *secondly*, in such examples as the following:

نَسَلْمْ مَكْنْ تَا مَتْ آبا دَا نْ شُوْدْ "Do not practise oppression,

that

that so your Empire may flourish;" which is nearly equivalent to the negative *تسلم من تا مکت ویران نشود* "Do not practise oppression, that so your Empire may *not* go to ruin."

Now the words *ما منع مشو تا بدر روم* obviously contain *two* negatives; namely, that comprised in the sense of the verb *To HINDER*, and that comprised in the prohibitive particle; and both together make an affirmative: *اجازت ده تا بدر روم* "Permit me to go out;" which is probably the reason why the particle *تا* is not here followed by a negative particle. And the sentence *تسلم من تا مکت ویران نشود* is better Persian, according to my judgment, (because more commonly used in the Language) than *تسلم من تا مکت آبادان گردد*; yet there is no error in substituting the affirmative *آبادان گردد*; for the negative *ویران نشود*; because the same proposition may, in every Language, be every where expressed according to the pleasure of the speaker either in its positive or negative form: as when we say of a man that "He is *not* clean in his person;" or, in other words, that "He is positively dirty."

With these two exceptions (and both are comparatively speaking of rare occurrence in the Language) I believe that the particle *تا* after the *نی* will be invariably followed by a negative particle: and, according to the opinion which I have just now stated, it is more common perhaps, and therefore more consistent with Persian idiom, to say *گفر من تا در دوزخ نروم* "Be not an infidel that you may *not* go to Hell," (in the negative) than it is to say *گفر من تا در جنت در آیم* "Be not an infidel that you may go to Heaven," where *تا* is followed by an affirmative sentence.

BUT

BUT the prohibitive is often followed by the particle **که** having a double sense; namely, that of **که** already mentioned; as **که** **کفر نکن** **که** **دوزخ نروی** "Be not an infidel that you may *not* go to Hell;" or (which is equally common after **که**, though not perhaps after **تا**) **که** **کفر نکن** **که** **در جنت در آئی** "Be not an infidel, that you *may* go to Heaven;" and that of **وَاَوْ** *Otherwise*; as **که** **کفر نکن** **که** **دوزخ نروی** "Be not an infidel, otherwise you *will* go to Hell;" &c. It is obvious, therefore, that the context can alone determine between these two senses of the particle **که**; and that whether we say **رَوِي** in the affirmative, or **نَرَوِي** in the negative form, the sense of the sentence remains unchanged. So, also, in the following and every similar Example:

بِهَر رُخسَرِ ظَلَمِ دَر مَسْجِ حَالِ

که غور بشید ملکَتِ یابَد زَوَالِ

"Never suffer the praeface of tyranny, that the sun of your Empire may *not* set:" (which is the best reading) or "Never suffer the praeface of tyranny, otherwise the sun of your Empire *will* set:" (which is also accurate, if we substitute **یابَد** for **نَبَاد** in the second line.)

THIS is the difference of sense between **که** and **تا** to which I referred a little way back; and the reader will easily perceive that it must be the same, whether these particles shall follow the Imperative or the Prohibitive mode. Examples:

رَخِ بَرِ اَقْرُو زِکَرِ فَا رِخِ بَرِ اَزْ بَرِ کَلَمِ (تا فَا رِخِ بَرِ اَزْ بَرِ کَلَمِ)

"Display the light of your countenance, that so you may detach my heart from the rose;" **اَزْ بَرِ جَاوَزْ کَزْ کَشْتِه شَوِي**

or

یا نانشته نشوی or نانشته نشوی ; but not نانشته نشوی
 "Get away from hence, otherwise you *will* be slain," or that "you
 may *not* be slain;" &c. The words ازین جا دور گذر نانشته نشوی
 would signify inevitably "Get away from hence that you
 may be slain;" and cannot possibly have any other sense.

SECTION FIFTH.

GENERAL PRINCIPLE.

HAVING now detailed the rules that relate to the application of the simple tenses of a Persian verb, including also the Imperative mode, it is obvious to remark that the application of the compound tenses, کرده باشم ; کرده بود ; کرده اید ; کرده است &c. depends on the use of the auxiliaries هست ; بود ; and باشد employed in the formation of such tenses. And as the use of those auxiliaries has already been discussed in CHAPTER SECOND, PAGE 298 of this volume, so it is wholly unnecessary to resume the consideration of that subject, already exhausted to the best of my ability.

It remains, therefore, to point out to the notice of the learner one general principle, which will be found to have considerable influence on the application of all the tenses of a Persian verb.

By the use of language, we are enabled to express our own sentiments, or to repeat the sentiments of other men; and, in the latter case, we may have recourse to SIMPLE NARRATIVE which is the common practice of the English Language; or to what may be termed DRAMATIC NARRATIVE, which is more consistent with the idiom of the Persian Tongue. By SIMPLE NARRATIVE, I mean "the repetition of sentiments expressed in the language of the narrator himself;" as "JAMES in-

informed me of his intention to leave Calcutta at a given time;" or "JAMES told me that he meant to leave Calcutta at a given time;" &c. And by **DRAMATIC NARRATIVE**, I mean "The retention, by the narrator, of the *very same* expressions which are supposed to have been uttered by the original speaker;" as "James told me I MEAN TO LEAVE CALCUTTA AT A GIVEN TIME;" in which case, the phrase "I mean to leave Calcutta at a given time;" is obviously assumed to have been uttered by JAMES. But we are accustomed to divine, and of course to narrate, the perceptions of other men, or what we conceive to be their perceptions, even though these have not been previously uttered: as "The lady perceived that her lover was captivated;" or "The lover observed that his mistress was disposed to favour his suit." And in this case also, a Persian is at liberty to assume the form of **DRAMATIC NARRATIVE**; as "The lady perceived *my* lover is captivated;" "The lover observed *my* mistress is disposed to favor *my* suit," &c. It is the object of the following rules to illustrate the application of this general principle to the purposes of speech.

RULE FIRST.

THE Narrator, having occasion to relate a conversation previously held between himself and another, will generally (I believe invariably in writing) assume the form of **DRAMATIC NARRATIVE** as already explained. Ex: زید گفت که در کلمه می رودم
 "ZYDE informed me that he was going to Calcutta;" or more literally, "ZYDE said, I AM GOING TO CALCUTTA;" which is the only form of construction consistent with the written idiom of the Persian Tongue. In conversation, I believe the form of simple Narrative may be sometimes, though rarely, observed to occur: as زید گفت که در کلمه خواهد رفت or زید گفت که در کلمه می رودم
 "ZYDE said that he would go to Calcutta."

کتابت

یکی از رفیقان کتابت روزگار نامساعد بنزد یکب من آورد که کتابت اندک

دادم و خیال بسیار و طاقتِ بارِ فاقدِ ادم و بارِ ادم که باقیم و بکر نقل
 کنم نادران صورت که زندگانی کنم کسی را بر نیک و بد من اطلاع نباشد باز از ثنات
 ابر اندیشم که بر طغنه و ز قفای من بخندند و سعی مراد در حیل بر هم مروت
 محل کنند و در علم محاسبه چنانکه معلوم است بجزئی دانم اگر بجا و نماند جی بین کرد که
 موجبِ تنبیه خاطر باشد بقیه عمر از عهدِ شکر آن توانم بیرون آمدن کنم ای یاد
 محلِ پادشاه و دو طرف دارد امید یاران و بیم جان و خلاصه دای خردمندان
 است بدان امید دین بیم افتادن دیدم که سنبری شود و نصیب من به غرض
 می شود و نزد یک صاحب دیوان رفتم بسابقه معرفی که بیانِ باب و صورت
 حالش بکنم تا بکار می مختصرش نصب کردند چند روز برین برآمد لطف طبعش
 بدیدند و حسن تدبیرش به پسندیدند کادش از آن در گذشت و به مرید بر ترازان
 ممکن شد و بنیم سخاوتش در ترقی بود تا با وج اراادت رسید و مقرب حضرت
 سلطان و تهنه علیه گشت در آن مدت مرا با جمیع یاران اتفاق سفریکه افتاد
 چون باز ادم دو منزل استقبال کرد ظاهر حالش دیدم بر ایشان و در بیات
 درویشان کنم حال چیست گفتم چنانکه تو گفتی لاف نه حسد بردند و بختاتم
 منسوب کردند الی آخره

سعدی

“ ONE of my friends complained to me of his evil fortune, saying ‘ I have little money and many children, and am no longer able to bear the miseries of want. I have often thought of going to another country, that live how I may, my condition may at least be unknown to others. Yet I fear the malice of my enemies, lest they should laugh in my absence, and impute to inhumanity my endeavours to provide for the wants of my family. Now you know that I have some skill in accounts; and if, through your interest, some means of support should be found for me, the remainder of my life will be insufficient for the grateful discharge of such an obligation.’ I replied ‘ O my friend! the service of Kings offers a double prospect, the hope of bread, and the fear of destruction; and to encounter the one for the sake of the other, is not consistent with the counsels of the wife.” I saw that he was (is) offended, and listened (listens) with dislike to my admonitions. I went to the master of the office of accounts and revenue, and in virtue of our previous intimacy together, represented to him the case of my friend, who was accordingly appointed to a trifling office. After a certain time, his genius and the approved merit of his management in office, obtained for him a higher situation; and the star of his prosperity continued to ascend, until at last he attained the summit of his wishes, and became a distinguished favorite of the King. It happened that I had then occasion to travel to Mecca, with my friends; and on my return home, he advanced two stages to meet me. I remarked the wretchedness of his appearance, and found that he had assumed the guise of a pauper. I asked ‘ what was (is) the matter?’ to which he replied, ‘ as you foretold, a faction were inspired with envy, and brought against me a charge of peculation;’ &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE Narrator, having occasion to relate a conversation previously held between two other persons, will generally,

rally, perhaps invariably in writing, assume the style of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. Examples: زید به بکر گفت که دُرُ کَلْتَه می رُوم
 "ZYDE said to BUKR, *I am going to Calcutta.*"
 زید به بکر گفت که دُرُ کَلْتَه بر و دُرُ کَلْتَه باید رُفت و خواهی رُفت
 ZYDE said to BUKR, GO TO CALCUTTA; or, YOU WILL OR MUST GO TO CALCUTTA; &c. This is more consistent with Persian idiom, than it would be to say دُرُ کَلْتَه بر و دُرُ کَلْتَه
 "ZYDE desired BUKR to go to Calcutta;" which is the form of simple narrative, perhaps occasionally observed to occur in conversation.

حکایت

روزی در خدمت مامون بودم بکنی از یاقوت دیدم متع ابر چهار انگشت و دو
 عرض دو انگشت و در صفاد و شنی چون خورشید نابان و ماهی در خشان
 بود پس زد و گوی را بخواند و گفت خانمی بسا که این یاقوت بکنی آن تواند
 بود و در کرباقوت بر گرفت و برنت قضا اردوزی دیگر هم در خدمت دی
 بودم که ازان انگشتری یاد کرد و بفرمود باز در کرد ایاد و دند چون زد که حاضر
 شد دیدم که در مشه بروی افتاده است و چون بدی لرزد مامون پرسید
 که سبب تغیر تو چیست گفت مرا امان ده تا بگویم گفت امان دادم زد و کر بکنی
 بیرون کرد به چهار باره شده گفت ای خلیفه انگشتری شایم و خواستم که بکنی
 را به بکنی دان برم از دست من برسد ان افتاد و به چهار باره شده مامون
 تبسم کرد و گفت برو و این را چهار انگشتری ساز و ترا سیج کنای نیست
 و این صورت که از مامون صادر شده عاقبت حاتم و بردباری است

" I WAS one day in company with the KHULEEFA MAMMOON, and there saw a Ruby, of four-fingers by two and a half, in lustre equal to the SUN or the Planet VENUS. MAMMOON sent for a goldsmith, and said to him, ' Make a ring for this stone.' The goldsmith took it accordingly, and went away. It happened that I was present on another occasion, when MAMMOON recollected the ring, and sent for the goldsmith, who appeared accordingly; and I observed, that he was (is) trembling like the leaf of a willow. MAMMOON asked him what was (is) the cause of his (your) uneasiness? He replied " Give me protection and I will inform you." MAMMOON rejoined, " I give (have given) you protection." The goldsmith took out the ruby broken into four pieces, and said, " O Prince! I made the ring, and was about to set the stone in the socket, when it fell from my hand on the anvil, and broke, as you perceive, into four pieces. MAMMOON smiled and said " Go then and make it into four rings, for this was (is) no fault of yours." The conduct of MAMMOON, on this occasion, exhibits an instance of the utmost clemency and forbearance."

R U L E T H I R D.

THE narrator having occasion to relate the sentiments of another man, previously delivered in writing, or in any form but that of conversation, will generally assume the style of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. In this case, he may nevertheless, assume the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE in written composition; though its assumption must, I believe, be considered as of rare occurrence in the Language. The following is an example of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, easily converted into the DRAMATIC form, by means of the alterations inserted between parentheses.

سکندر ذوالقرنین در وقت وفات وصیت کرد که دستش (دستم) را از

تا بوی بیرون کند از دنیا تا همان معاینه کنند که با آن ملک و مال عاقبت نهی دست

نی رود (می روم) و از که چه کار دارد فاجایم بقا استحال کرد (کردم) و از آن
 همه خزان و دقائش موفور هر دست نبی با خود چیزی بکود نبرده (نبردیم)
 الی آخره

"ALEXANDER surnamed ZOOL KURNYNE, at the period of his death, directed in his will that his (my) hands might (or may) be left out of the coffin, exposed to public view; that so, all men might (or may) see that with all his (or my) power and wealth, he (or I) quitted the world empty-handed, and carried nothing to the grave, of the abundant treasure which he (or I) possessed in his (or my) life." &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE narrator, having occasion to state the unuttered conceptions of another man, or what he (the narrator) believes to be his thoughts or conceptions, will generally assume the style of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. Examples: پسر دانست که دل آرد تخته من است "The youth knew that such a man was fond of him; or more literally "The youth knew that SUCH A MAN IS FOND OF ME," (the youth.) But in this case, the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, though of rare occurrence, may be sometimes observed in written composition. Example from SAUDEE: پسر دانست که دل آرد تخته او است "The youth knew that such a man was fond of him;" "و این گردنک را آید تخته او" : "And that the dust of mischief had been excited by him;" (the youth.) &c.

C O N C L U S I O N.

IT follows from all the preceding rules, that the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, though sometimes admissible, is always at variance with the common usage of the Persian Tongue. And
 on

on the contrary, the form of **DRAMATIC NARRATIVE** is always congenial with Persian idiom, whether applied in the manner described in the rules, or to any other of the purposes of speech. On the other hand the happy and versatile genius of our Language is easily accommodated to either idiom; and though of the two, simple narrative is perhaps more consonant to the common usage of the Language, it is nevertheless true that the dramatic form of narration may be always accurately assumed by an English speaker, if not with elegance, at least without the danger of being unintelligible to his hearer on any occasion. On the contrary, the Anglo-Persian scholar, who ventures to assume the form of simple narrative, will be very generally unintelligible to his hearers; and hence follows obviously an important rule of Persian translation, by which the writer is generally bound "to convert into the dramatic form, those simple narratives that are to be translated into Persian, from the English or other European Tongues." It is only necessary to add, that the sentiments of the narrator himself may be sometimes mistaken for those of the person whose condition he describes, though a little attention to the context will easily enable us to rectify the error if it should happen to occur. Thus **NEZAUMEE**, having occasion to describe the repentance of **NOWSHERAWAUN** for the commission of certain acts of injustice into which he had been led in the beginning of his reign, adds a general observation on the effects of injustice, which might possibly, at first sight, be imputed to **NOWSHERAWAUN**.

دست بر زانو نمی گزشت

عاجل بی داد بحر گریه و جغت

"He struck his hand on his head, and wept for a time; what, but weeping, is the result of injustice!"

SECTION

SECTION SIXTH.

ON THE APPLICATION OF VERBS CONSIDERED AS لازم و متعدي
OR NEUTER AND TRANSITIVE.

ALL intransitive verbs are considered as neuter by the Persian Grammarians; and thus the verb رفتن *To go*, which has been termed active intransitive by English writers, is considered by them as a neuter verb. An active verb, as گستریدن *To spread*, is also termed neuter with reference to the causal verb گسترانیدن which is formed from it; because the verb گستریدن requires but one object, whereas گسترانیدن admits of two.

THE same verb may be at once neuter and active, as سوختن *To burn*; and provided the sense of a neuter verb shall be found to exist in the agent or nominative, it signifies nothing whether his *will* has any thing to do in the matter or not: as آبشداوم *I flooded*, which is a voluntary action; مردم *I died*, which is by no means voluntary. This view of the subject has given occasion to the following metrical commentary on the AGENT OR NOMINATIVE to a neuter verb.

مات زید زید چون فاعل بود بلکه فاعل نیست او فاعل بود
او ز روی نحو نقط فاعل ست و ز نه او مقبول و متوش فاعل ست

"ZYDE died! How can ZYDE be the agent of the verb! He is not the agent; he is altogether passive. He is the agent, indeed, in the language of Grammar; but in fact he is the object or sufferer, (or person slain) and DEATH is the executioner who has made an end of him."

I HAVE nothing to observe on the application of neuter verbs to the purposes of speech; and the rules that relate to the accusative

cusative or object of a transitive verb have already been detailed in CHAPTER VII, PAGE 189 of this volume. It remains to consider the application of verbs transitive to more than a single object; and the few unimportant observations that occur on the subject, are accordingly detailed in the following rules.

R U L E F I R S T.

Of two objects to the same verb, the first may stand to the second in the relation of the *فَاعِل* to the *مَفْعُولُ بِهِ*; and in this case, the first will be seldom inserted in the sentence. Example: *زَيْدٌ فَرَشَ سُكَّرًا* "ZYDE caused (BUKR or any body else) to spread the carpet;" &c. Now, it is obvious, that the first object BUKR is here the *spreader* of the carpet; and the CARPET itself is the *thing spread*; from which it follows that they stand, with reference to each other, in the relation of the *فَاعِل* to the *مَفْعُولُ بِهِ*. In such examples, the first object (BUKR) is very seldom inserted in speech, or if inserted, it must generally (perhaps invariably) follow the preposition *أَرُ*. Example: *زَيْدٌ أَرُ بَكْرٍ فَرَشَ سُكَّرًا* "ZYDE caused BUKR to spread the carpet;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

Of two objects to the same verb, the second may be an attributive applicable to the first; and in this case, both must be invariably inserted in the sentence, and the first will follow the termination *ا*. Examples: *زَيْدٌ وَجَّهًا رَأًى بَلَدًا سَاحَتًا* "ZYDE made the wall high;" *بَكْرٌ زَيْدًا رَأًى ثَوْبًا كَرِيمًا* "BUKR enriched ZYDE," or "made ZYDE rich;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

Of two objects to the same verb, the one may stand to the other in the relation of the receiver to the thing received;

4 T

and,

and, in this case, the **مفعول به** or true object of the verb, (namely, that noun which is in the accusative case) will receive or reject the termination **ا**, according to the rules detailed in CHAPTER VII, PAGE 189 of this volume, for the rejection or insertion of that termination. In the event of its insertion, the other object must receive the particle **به**; and in the case of its omission, it may receive that particle or the termination **ا**. Examples: **اَسْبَابِ خَانِه را بَرِيْد سَبَرْدَم**

"I committed the household furniture to ZYDE;"

مَجْنُونِي اَز زَرَرَتِيْد را دَاْدَم or **مَجْنُونِي اَز زَرَرَتِيْد دَاْدَم** "I gave

ZYDE a sum of money;" &c. Both or either object are often omitted in speech after the verbs of this class; *first*, because we have sometimes occasion to define merely, the nature of the action itself; as **زَيْد مِي دِهَد و مِي بَخْشَد** "ZYDE

gives and bestows;" *secondly*, because we have sometimes occasion to define exclusively the object of bounty, without reference to the thing bestowed; as **زَيْد بَه بَكْر مِي دِهَد**

"ZYDE gives (money, &c.) to BUKR;" and, *finally*,

because we have sometimes occasion to define the thing bestowed without reference to the object of bounty; as **زَيْد اَسْب را مِي دِهَد و زَر مِي بَخْشَد** "ZYDE gives away horses and money;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

Of two objects to the verbs **گفتَن**, **فرمودَن**, or any other verbs having the same, or nearly the same sense, the one is often a perfect sentence, and the other, being a simple substantive noun, will commonly receive the particles **را** and **به**; or **با**; &c. Example: **بَرِيْد و باز يَد و زَيْد را اَتَقَم كِرَا دَب اَمُوَز**

"I said to ZYDE: LEARN MANNERS;" &c. In this case, the sentence generally follows the verb: but some exceptions may be

be found in poetry; as *چرا گفتیم شهر اندر نیایی* "I said WHY DO YOU NOT ENTER THE CITY," where the verb follows the Interrogative *چرا*; &c. The particle *که* is often omitted; as *زید را گفتیم آداب آموز*; or, in the case of a command, superceded by *نا*; as *بفرمود نا اسب را زین کنند* "He gave orders to saddle the horse," &c. The omission of either object depends on the existence of a *قرینه*, by which the hearer may be enabled to supply its absence: as *اگر بر آبی که بر آبی بکند بر خواهی گشت (آن را)* "If you are determined to drive me away, to whom shall I state (the case;)" &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

Of two objects to the same verb, the first may stand to the second in the relation of the SUBJECT to the PREDICATE of a given preposition: as "ZYDE saw, knew, thought, or believed, AMR to be learned or virtuous," &c. or "ZYDE knew that AMR was learned," which is equivalent to the phrase "ZYDE knew the learning of AMR." There is therefore, properly speaking, but one object (namely, *the learning of AMR*, which is the sense of the sentence,) to any given verb of this class; and the verbs themselves are termed *أفعال التنبؤ* or VERBS OF PERCEPTION, because they indicate operations of the mind, in which the members of the body have no share. In another sense, they cease to be verbs of perception, requiring, in that case, but one object: as "ZYDE saw AMR;" "ZYDE knew BUKR;" &c. In the Persian Language, they are commonly followed by a perfect sentence: as *زید دانست که بکر دانا است* "ZYDE knew BUKR to be wise;" and the other form of construction, namely *زید دانای بکر دانست* "ZYDE knew the wisdom of BUKR," though not inaccurate, is of rare occurrence.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

A **VERB** may be transitive to three objects; as in the case of **آموزانیدن**; **آموختن**; &c. In this case, one of the objects will follow the preposition **از**; another will be followed by the termination **را**, and the third will receive the prepositions **به** or **با**. Example: **من را بریدم آموختن از فلان** "I made such a man teach ZYDE knowledge." Or, in the event of the omission of **را** after the first object, it may be accurately given to the second: as **من را بریدم آموختن از فلان** "I caused such a man to teach ZYDE knowledge;" &c. Any one or all these objects may be occasionally omitted in speech: as in the common phrase, **خدا می داند خدا می دهد** "God gives and is the cause of giving;" **زیده ز مردمی داند** "ZYDE causes money to be given;" &c.

SECTION SEVENTH.

ON THE INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS.

THE tenses of a Persian verb are inflected into the first, second, and third persons, singular and plural; as **گفتم**; **گفتند**; **گفتید**; **گفتند**; &c. And the natural application of these persons to the purposes of speech, is too obvious to require, or even to admit of illustration by the rules of Grammar. I shall therefore, in the present section of this Chapter, merely point out to the notice of the learner, certain *deviations* from the order of nature, which have been generally adopted in the Persian Language, in order to mark the respect of the speaker for those whom he may have occasion to address.

RULE FIRST.

In the Persian, as in other tongues, the common forms of politeness generally require the use of the plural number, when

when we address or speak of a given individual who happens to be of equal or higher rank than ourselves. Example:

یا امیر المؤمنین سبب چیست که شما در لباس جامه درشت اینجا فرموده اید

"O commander of the faithful! why do you chuse to appear habited in vestments of coarse cloth?"

آن حضرت این مضمون را ادا فرمودند "His Majesty or His Excellency observed as follows;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE DEITY must be addressed in the singular number, because there is an obvious impropriety in applying to him the idea of plurality. Examples: یا الهی یه تو تو بیغم "O God!

Grant me grace;" حق تعالی چنین گفت "The most high God has thus spoken;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

By a refined form of civility common to the Persian and to most other Tongues, the singular number is often applied to a given individual, for the purpose of denoting that the exaltation of his rank, or his eminence for virtue, learning, or talents, &c, is such as to render the common forms of respect inapplicable to him. Example:

جرات من در آمان به نصرت تو و ناتوانی من از عقوبت
تو آزان عفو تو بزرگ تر خواهد بود

"The clemency of your disposition is greater than my boldness in coming into your presence, and braving the punishment that you may inflict;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE pomp of Eastern manners has permitted the private gentlemen of ASIA to assume the regal style of EUROPE;

and they seldom fail to employ it, by issuing, in the first person plural, their sublime commands to their inferiors, or to those with whom they may happen to converse. Examples: **اَوْرَا جَنِبَن نَر مُوَدِئِم** " I thus commanded or spoke to him;" **نَرَا جَنِبَن اِرْشَاد كَرْدِئِم** " I thus commanded or directed you," &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

BETWEEN equals, the forms of politeness usually require that each party should modify his address on the supposition that he himself is inferior in rank to the other. Ex: **بَدَه عَرَض كَرْدَم** " Your slave observed;" **يَا ز مَنَد اِنْتِهاس نَمُودَم** " Your dependant mentioned;" &c. The rule being impartially applicable to both parties, there is here no degradation on either side; and we might as reasonably refuse to finish an English letter in the ordinary terms established by custom, as to comply with this equally unmeaning ceremony. The use of the first person (**بَدَه عَرَض كَرْدَم**) is here more idiomatical, or at least more commonly established in modern Persia, than that of the third; (**بَدَه عَرَض كَرْد**) which generally prevails in Hindoostan, and indeed among the writers of ancient Persia. Let us suppose an ellipsis in the sentence; (**مِنْ بَدَه عَرَض كَرْدَم** " I your slave mentioned,") or let us admit with the Persians, that the letter **م** is the pronominal nominative to the verb **كَرْدَم**; and the grammatical accuracy of the phrase will be easily defensible in either case.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE servility of INDIA has the merit of surpassing that of PERSIA, and hence it happens that Indian gentlemen have, in a great measure, banished from their conversation the use of the first and second personal pronouns, and of the first and

and second persons of the verb. In addressing a superior, they seem to proceed on the supposition that they are wholly unworthy of being admitted into his presence, and therefore designate both parties in the third person; "جناب بر بندہ چہین ارشاد فرمودہ" His Excellency thus commanded his slave; &c. as if neither party were present in the room. Nay, they will often go farther; and meaning to enquire into the state of the superior's health, will deliberately ask him, "How his august *servants* do this morning," (یزاج نماز مان عالی امروز چہ حال دارو) or when he happens to be ill, "What sickness or accident has befallen his *enemies*?" "I have شہید شد کہ بہ نصیب احد اعدای رؤی دادہ" heard that an illness has happened to your enemies;") by which they mean to intimate their wishes for his prosperity and the destruction of his foes. The Language moves on heavily under the load of such cumbrous fetters as these; and the ends of flattery have been long since lost in the mere common place of customary speech. It would require a quarto volume to illustrate the written forms adulatory address, and I shall very willingly decline the performance of the task, and bequeath it as a legacy to my successor in office.

It remains only to mark the occasional use of the third for the first person singular of the verb, according to the principle already noticed in PAGE 65 of this volume.

EXAMPLE FROM JAUMEE.

بجای نیل من بودی چہ بودی ز پابو شش من آسودی چہ بودی

"Would that I had supplied the place of the river NILE! that I had enjoyed the happiness of killing his feet! (the feet of JOSEPH)." The reader will easily perceive that the words

و من بودی and من آسودی are here used for من آسودی

من آسم دمی and there are many other examples of the same nature.

SECTION EIGHTH.

OCCASIONAL OMISSION OF PERSIAN VERBS.

As the Persian Language delights in the abbreviations of speech above all others with which I have any acquaintance, so it often happens, and more especially in poetry, that verbs and whole members of a sentence are elegantly omitted whenever the context is of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission. I believe, however, that the subject is too indefinite in its own nature to admit of much illustration by the rules of Grammar; and the examples comprised in the following rules, are therefore offered, merely as a *specimen*, with a view to excite the attention of the reader, to a hundred others that will fall in his way.

RULE FIRST.

In a conditional sentence, the verb may be accurately omitted in the first member of the sentence whenever it shall happen to be expressed in the second. Example:
 گزیده گران ریش تو مرا می کشی "If others have wounded, be it your business to heal;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

In a conditional sentence, the verb is sometimes omitted in the second member of the sentence, whenever it happens to be expressed in the first. Example:

چند بر گفتند او میگوید
 چو عالم نباشی کم از شنیدم

"Several men were listening to his conversation. If you are not learned, be at least a listener;" (کم از شنیدم باش)

RULE

RULE THIRD.

In a conditional sentence, the second member is often *wholly* omitted, in order to make way for some other sentence of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission.

Examples: ناسزاى را چه بسنى بخيار عاتقان تسليم كردند اختيار

"When you see the unworthy favored by fortune, (اختيار گن تسليم را) do you be resigned to the will of God)

for such has been generally the conduct of the wise."

گر آرزوى نجاتى و نجاتى شده بلاك تراست و بطر ايز طوفان برباك

"If another have suffered from the want of means to escape, you have the means, (ترا مايز نجاتى است) and what has a duck to fear from the storm?" that is to say, "you cannot suffer, having in your possession the means to escape;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

In the case of a parenthetical sentence, the verb is very commonly omitted. Examples: زنده باد و شش به بزرگبين گشت

"ZINDZ (may he be remembered with praise) thus observed;"

بر روىش سپاه بدين حرکت نمود "BUKA (may his face be black) thus acted;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

In the case of WARNING, the verb *پرهيزكن* Beware, is very commonly omitted, and must be supplied in order to complete the structure of the sentence. In this case, the object of that verb follows, invariably, the preposition را. Example:

از اين گريبه گون ناك تا چند چند بيشبرى توان زد و شش گرسنگ بند

"Beware of this treacherous world;" (پرهيزكن از اين گريبه گون ناك)

"How long will your courage serve you to master it," or, in other words, "It will one day or other master you." So also in the following lines of SAUDE; since there is no verb expressed in

any part of the poem, with which to connect the preposition **از**.
 اَرَزِينِ مَهْ پارَهْ مایِدِ فَرَبِیسی مَلایِکِ صُورَتِی مَآوُوسِ زِیَیسی
 "Beware of this beautiful lady, with a face like the moon,
 the form of an angel, the splendor of a peacock, and grace
 to seduce the abstinent hermit;" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE verb will be often omitted in the **حال**; when it happens
 to occur as a perfect sentence applicable to the **ذوالحال**. Ex-
 ample: گَرِ آوِ اَزِ مِ دِی سَنِ مَرْدَهْ دَرِ گُورِ بَرِ آسایدِ رَوَانِ دَرِ دَمْدَمِ
 "If you speak to me when I am dead in the grave, it will be
 the means of rest to my wounded spirit." N. B. The
 word **بَسَرَهْ تَوَصِیْتِی** **مِنِ** is not here followed by the vowel

R U L E S E V E N T H.

THE verbs **گفت**, **فرمود**, &c. are very commonly omitted
 in poetry; but in such a manner that the omission is easily
 supplied by the understanding of the reader. Example:

وَرَوِیدِ چُونِ اَنزِ دَما بَرِ گُوزِیَنِ بَدِ خَشَمِی کُودِ وَرِ اَفْتَدِ اَزِ سَنگِ وَزَنِ
 کِهْ دَرِ سَنِ بَرِ تَرَمِ آ زِی وَیَدِهْ کِهْ تَوَلَاوِ اَوِ را بَسَرِیدِهْ فَلَاحِی
 "He looked at him frowning, with an eye kindled into rage,
 as a dragon looks at his destined prey; (the elk) saying, "What
 weakness of disposition have you observed in me, that you
 presume to prefer the steel of *his* temper?"

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE words **بِهْدِ اِی**, **بِهْدِ اَشَنِی**, **گُوَیا**, **گُوَی**, **گَفْتِی** are
 commonly used to signify "You might say;" or "You might
 have said;" "You might suppose;" or "You might have
 thought;" &c. And are generally employed in the case of a
 simile, which the poet, by way of hyperbole, chuses to put into
 the

the mouth of his reader. They seem, therefore, to supply the place of the continuative preterite, and may be considered as the *مَشْرُط* of a *جَسْرَا*, which is understood in the sentence:

namely, *اگر تویی دیدی چنین می گفتی* "Had you seen it, you would have said;" &c. Examples: *تو گفتی که هرگز ز ما در نزار*,

"You might have said (had you seen him) that he had never been born;" (a hyberbole of FIRDŌUSEE, meant to indicate the effectual manner in which one of his warriors had put his enemy to death;)" *نوگوئی دو گوشم بر آواز او دست*

"You might say that my two ears were fastened to his voice;"

گو یازدا در ده روز حساب را "You seem to have forgotten the day of judgment;" *پنداشنی که آفتاب بر آرد*

"You might have mistaken her for the rising sun;" (the poet is speaking of the appearance of his mistress;)" *یک پنداری آفتاب پیش آفتاب*

"You might suppose that the night covers and conceals the day;" (alluding, probably, to the black hair hanging over the face of some fair damsel:) &c.*

THE word *گو* is merely a contraction for *گویند*; or *فگویند* in the second person singular followed by ALIF; and the uncontracted *گویند* is sometimes, though rarely, observed to occur: as *گویند لبش لبست از جان شیرین بسته آمد* "Your lips may be said to be formed of the matter of spirit;" &c.

SECTION NINTH.

OF THE RELATION EXISTING BETWEEN THE *مَشْرُط* AND THE *جَسْرَا*

THE relation between the *مَشْرُط* and the *جَسْرَا* seems to be that of CAUSE and EFFECT; for if it be affirmed that "If you

* We are apt, and certainly with justice, to censure the extravagance of Eastern metaphor. I know not whether the critics will sustain my admiration of that which follows, but I am at least certain, that it is conceived and expressed in the true magnificence of Oriental taste.

"O the doth teach the torches to burn bright!

"Her beauty hangs upon the cheek of night,

"Like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear."

fit

fit I will sit;" " If you stand I will stand;" &c. it is obvious that my " sitting," or " standing," is made to depend on yours, as every effect depends on its cause. The same thing is true of every general proposition, expressed by means of a relative pronoun; for if we affirm that " The man that hath not music in his soul, is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils," it follows obviously, that the malconformation of the poor man's ear is treated by the speaker as the cause of his fitness for such alarming enterprizes.

BUT if the relation be that of CAUSE and EFFECT, it should seem to follow that there must be, invariably, some difference of sense between the two propositions comprised in either member of the sentence; and for this plain reason, *namely*, " because the same proposition cannot be at once the cause and effect of itself." Accordingly, the proposition comprised in the *حَسْرَة*, generally differs from that contained in the *شَرْط*; and so, also, the proposition comprised in the relative clause of a given sentence, is seldom repeated in the predicate or second member of the same sentence.

YET the *حَسْرَة* is sometimes found, in every Language, to consist merely in the repetition of the *شَرْط*; as *زَيْدٌ اِذَا كَرِهَ يَأْتِي*; " If ZYDE is not come, why then he is not come;" and so, also, the predicate of a sentence comprising a relative clause is found, sometimes, to consist merely in the repetition of the relative clause; as " What has been, has been;" " What will be, will be;" and other examples of the same nature.

In this case, the hearer is probably supposed to expect, in the second proposition, or member of the sentence, an explanation of the consequences likely to result from the first; and if the expected consequences, whether good or evil, shall not be likely to happen at all, the speaker, in that case, will naturally enough adopt the form of construction to which I have

have adverted, in order, by the repetition of *بِسْمِ* in the place of the *شَرَط*, to shew that the latter is wholly abortive; or in other words, that the former will be followed by no consequences of any kind.

I HAVE been seduced into this explanation (which may be thought too obvious to merit the attention of the reader,) from a desire to bring under his notice the not unfrequent occurrence of this form of construction, which is a favorite figure among the Persian Poets. It is most commonly employed by them, to indicate the unsubdued and forbearing patience with which a Persian lover submits to the unmerited pangs inflicted by the fair and capricious object of his vows. The following example shall here suffice.

برقی عشق آرد خوس بَشَبَه بُویشی موقت موقت
 جور شاه کازمان سگر برگد ای می رفت رفت
 سگر دلی از عمره دل دار باری بر دیر و
 در میان جان و جانان ماجرای رفت رفت

THE very simplicity of these verses renders the translation a matter of difficulty; and I shall therefore transfer the task to the reader. It may be necessary, however, to apprise him that the word *جان* signifies *the lover*, or more literally *his soul*; and that the word *جانان* (His mistress) is a relative noun derived from *جان*. The particle *که* redundant, which is found in conversation to occur occasionally between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, as *فلان کتاب که حاضر است* "Such a book is ready;" may be also observed to occur occasionally in writing, between the two members of a conditional sentence: as

هر سوخته جانی که به کشمیر در آید سگر مرغ کتاب است که با مال و پیر آید عرفی

“ Every parched creature that enters Kishmeer, even though a roasted fowl, recovers there its wings and feathers.” (Such is the salubrious climate of that happy country.)

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE little more to observe on the nature and application of Persian verbs to the purposes of speech. In treating of the use of tenses, I have not found it necessary or expedient to assume as a principle of reference, the use of the corresponding tenses of an English verb; *first*, because the natural application of every tense must be the same in both (or to speak more accurately) in all Languages: *secondly*, because this natural application of tenses is founded on self-evident principles, such as to admit of no illustration by the rules of grammar: *thirdly*, because the accidental deviations from the order of nature, or in other words the use of one tense for another, constitutes, therefore, the only proper object of grammatical research: *fourthly*, because such deviations are more easily discovered by referring to the order of nature itself, than to the arbitrary standard of any given Language: *fifthly*, because every deviation from the order of nature that may happen to occur in a given Language, if not wholly unaccountable, must admit of its true explanation without the least reference to any other Tongue: *sixthly*, because it follows that the aid of a reference to the English or any other Language, though it might be occasionally useful in the way of illustration, was not therefore by any means necessary to the accomplishment of the object which I had in view: and *finally*, because I have never had occasion to consider the rules that regulate the application of the tenses of an English verb, and am therefore very imperfectly acquainted with the subject.

I OFFER these observations in order to guard the reader against a misconception of the nature of my plan; for if it
were

were taken for granted that the application of the tenses of an English verb, and not the order of nature, had been assumed by me as the standard of reference, then the rules for the application of Persian tenses would seem, on that account, to be more imperfect than they are otherwise likely to be found. To explain by an example.

It is neither necessary, nor very practicable to illustrate by rule, the use of the simple past tense of the Persian verb comprised in the following couplet; because there is here no deviation from the order of nature, the past tense of the verb being employed, as it should be employed, to indicate the occurrence of a past event.

ای و بختای و بختای در بخت کأن چنان مایه زمان شد ز بر بخت مولوی روم
 "ALAS! Alas! that such a moon as this *has been* hidden by the clouds."

YET the example before us might be translated into English by means of another tense of the verb. "Alas! Alas! that such a moon as this *should be* hidden by the clouds;" and it seems to me that the *onus probandi* here rests with the English Grammarian, because the deviation (if any) from the order of nature is clearly on the side of our own Language. Accordingly, I am not quite sure that I understand the true meaning of the word "should" in this and other similar examples; but whatever may be its true meaning, I have already stated my opinion, that the discussion of the question falls to the lot of the writers on English Grammar, and I have no desire to encroach on their province.

It only remains to be remarked, that certain Arabic or Persian verbs, or perfect propositions, are sometimes used in the sense of nouns substantive or adjective; &c. as *بر بخت* and *خیر بخت* Welfare; *شاد باش* for *شاد باش* Praise or Appro-

Approbation; دشت مرئزاد "May your hand never lose its powers!" now sometimes employed as a substantive noun to signify *Approbation*; کن بکن "Do and let alone;" (*Commands and Prohibitions*;) دش بکش *Difficulty*; ایتهم "He does not know;" or *Ignorant*; اباالی "I do not fear;" or *Fearless*; یعنی *It means*; or *Namely*; &c. &c. I now proceed to consider the application of PERSIAN PARTICLES to the purposes of speech.

OF PARTICLES.

CHAPTER FIRST.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

I HAVE already explained the ideas which I entertain of the true nature and use of particles, and am under no temptation to recur to the discussion of that abstracted and disputed point. It is enough to observe (and the remark will be deemed important by those who aim at the knowledge of truth) that though much of the accuracy of my reasoning may be overthrown, the existence and structure of the Arabic Language will still present an insuperable barrier against the admission of Mr. TOOKE's principles on the broad basis of UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR. With the single exception of that Language, I shall grant all that Mr. TOOKE can desire; I shall suppose that he has traced the particles of every other Tongue to their true origin as nouns or verbs. And having yielded this most liberal concession, I shall then shew that the Arabic Language abounds in letters (the servile letters) not significant in their own right, but merely in the right of some other word (as علم *Knowledge*; with which they must be therefore invariably

invariably connected. Examples: *Knowing*: *مَعْلُوم*
Known: *مَعْلُوم* *Omniscient*: &c. &c.

THE reader will easily perceive that these letters intersect the radical in all its points; and this intersection will prevent, for ever, the success of him who shall endeavour to prove that they were originally self significant words. For the choice of the proper *place* of intersection, as well as the choice of the proper letters, is obviously necessary to their significant character; and in the event of the occurrence of two or more letters in the same word, as *Known*, *مَعْلُوم*, &c. they are often found to intersect the radical in *different* points.

It is obvious therefore, *first*, that these letters are not now significant in their own right; *secondly*, that they were never significant in their own right at any former period of time; and *finally*, that they are and always have been significant when combined with certain other words (as *Known*, *مَعْلُوم*, Primitive *Knowledge*; *مَعْلُوم* *Understood*, Primitive *Understanding*; &c.) on which the significance of their character therefore depend.

HAVING thus established the conditional significance of these letters, it follows that I have *ipso facto* established a right to treat them as a certain species of words; and the question directly occurs, to what species of words they must be assigned? Now they cannot be assigned to the class of NOUNS or VERBS, because Nouns and Verbs are self significant according to the opinion of every Grammarian; and they must be therefore assigned to the class of PARTICLES, of which the characteristic is, that their significance depends on a certain combination. This fact being conceded to me, I shall very willingly grant in my turn that they form a very peculiar species of Particles, perhaps unknown to every other Tongue: but

then it is doubtless equally true, that of all imaginable particles they are the most artificial in their own nature, and consequently the most difficult of invention by a rude people. To admit the invention of these primary Particles, and to deny the probable invention of others that are less artificial in their own nature, appears to me, therefore, to be an inconsistency such as no fair reasoner will venture to maintain.

We must then suppose (which is very unphilosophical in my opinion) that the structure of the Arabic Language, if not inspired, is at least the result of premeditated reflexion; the work of the Learned in that country, prepared at some remote period of time, and submitted to the approbation of their countrymen, by whom it was adopted on the strength, merely, of its own merits; or we must admit that the most artificial, and in many respects the most admirable structure of Language that can be imagined, may and does owe its existence to the unpremeditated efforts of a rude people. For the excellence of the structure of the Arabic Language may be rendered obvious in a very few words, and that point once established, the conclusion I think must follow of course.

Let us suppose a body of learned Academicians assembled for the purpose of devising a system of Speech, at once simple in structure, and of a genius so admirably comprehensive as to provide, not merely for the expression of existing ideas, but even for the probable wants of future generations, through the endless revolution of a hundred centuries. Now I affirm that however visionary the scheme may appear, its object has been completely attained in the Arabic Language, which is provided, *first*, with an ample stock of words to express the ideas that exist in the Language; and, *secondly*, with means much more ample of expressing unborn ideas (if I may be permitted to use the expression) that have never yet been called into use.

For

For it is a well known principle of the Language that every triliteral root has received a capacity to assume every possible form of inflexion; and those forms are multiplied to the number of three or four hundred, by the excellent and very artificial system of intersecting the radical in all its points.* But the possible inflexions of one word are precisely the same with those of another; and the simplicity of structure is therefore preserved to the very utmost practicable extent. Let us now suppose that the Arabic Roots or primitive nouns amount to the number of 4,000; and these multiplied by 300, the assumed number of possible inflexions, will yield a quotient of TWELVE HUNDRED THOUSAND words, the forms of which, if they should be required, we can determine with as much certainty as if every one of them were now in use.

Now I imagine that ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND words may be assumed, as the greatest number that have ever been required or employed in any Language; but if we double that number (since the argument will admit of any concession) it still remains that there exist, in the Arabic Language, A MILLION of words that have never yet been called into use. Now I grant that these words are not significant, and are never likely to become so now; *first*, because the Language is already copious beyond the utmost limits of existing utility; *secondly*, because there is therefore occasion to diminish, not to increase, the rich vocabulary of existing terms; *thirdly*, because the significant inflexions of every word must be circumscribed by the nature of the idea which it is formed to denote; and, *finally*, because we cannot therefore derive a significant verb (for example) from a root which is not naturally or by sense the source of a verb.

* This intersection does not, as it might be suspected, generally occasion any difficulty in the discovery of the radical letters to a practised eye. There are examples, indeed, in which it is impossible to determine which are the radical, and which the servile letters; but these are by no means numerous, and generally speaking, the radical letters will be instantly recognized by any tolerable Arabic scholar. I have not counted the possible inflexions of an Arabic root, but I have no doubt that they amount to the number of at least 300, assumed in the text.

HENCE

HENCE it happens (to use the language of RICHARDSON, borrowed, however, from the learned MENINSKI) that " some Arabic roots are significant in one form of inflexion, many in several, and none in all ;" and the remark is not merely true in itself, but follows of necessity from the nature of things. Admitting its truth, which is beyond all question, it would yet be very absurd to infer that the principle by which every root is rendered susceptible of every possible form of inflexion, is therefore a mere refinement, of no apparent practical use: for, on the contrary, I do not hesitate to ascribe to the utility, grandeur, and (may I not say) the sublime philosophy of that principle, much of the systematic harmony of structure, brevity, force, and precision of expression, for which the Arabic Language may have been equalled, but never, I think, can be surpassed.

For what is the object or the consequence of such a principle, but that of ensuring, *first*, the existence in the Language of every imaginable significant inflexion that can be formed or required from a given root; and, *secondly*, of preserving, in the terms of Speech, an affinity similar to that which is found to exist in the nature of things? For if we examine the English, or any other Language in which the abovementioned principle does not operate, we shall be sure to find the affinity in question constantly violated; as in the case of A SHIP, A FLEET, and A NAVY; three words of the same family, intimately connected together by sense, and utterly disjoined in point of etymology. Now it would be certainly more philosophical to have made SHIP the root of the other two, than it is to have recourse to the very inartificial system which we have adopted on this and other similar occasions; yet it must be admitted that the three words in question *exist* in the Language; and, though utterly unconnected in point of etymology, they are not certainly, on that account, the less applicable to every practical purpose of speech.

BUT

BUT though these three words exist in the Language, are we quite certain that the same fact is universally true of other words? that the Language is not deficient in terms required to express a given PRIMITIVE, of which the derivative is of common occurrence; or a given DERIVATIVE, of which the primitive is of common use? If the question were put to an Arab, with reference to his own Language, he might return the following satisfactory answer. "Our Language has provided systematically against the occurrence of all such accidents; *first*, because our primitives are, generally speaking, *substantive* nouns, which are the true materials of Language; the source, in short, to which verbs, adjectives, epithets, participles, and other derivatives of every species must be ultimately referred; *secondly*, because we have rendered every primitive or substantive noun susceptible of every possible form of inflexion, by which it may be easily converted into the form of any given derivative that may be required, such as a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun; &c. *thirdly*, because we have already formed, according to this principle, all the derivatives of every species that have been hitherto actually required in the Language; and *finally*, because the same principle will enable us to form an endless variety of new derivatives, never hitherto called into use, if these should happen to be required hereafter." *

If the same question were put to an Englishman, he must be compelled to admit; *first*, that the English Language has not provided systematically against the occurrence of such

* I AM well persuaded, that the Arab writers are not unfrequently found to invent *new* significant forms of inflexion, according to the principle stated in the text; and the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEEE and other books, will furnish many examples of their occurrence. For the established significant inflexions of every ROOT are, or ought to be recorded in every Arabic Lexicon; but the author of the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEEE, has employed many significant forms of inflexions that are not to be found in any Lexicon. I conclude, therefore, that the significance of those inflexions has no other foundation than that of the authority of the author in question. They are, however, easily intelligible on reference to the established significance of the ROOTS from which they are derived.

accidents as these ; and, *secondly*, that such accidents are obviously of common occurrence in the Language ; as in the case of OBLONG, which has no corresponding substantive noun (OBLONGALITY ;) or OBLOQUY, from which, though plainly by sense the source of an adjective, no legitimate adjective can be derived. It is needless to multiply the examples of this nature, which will occur in abundance to every man who will take the trouble to turn over the leaves of an English Dictionary ; and I shall merely observe, that the deficiency of our Language in this respect, is the necessary source of many circumlocutions, such as an Arab will seldom or never have occasion to employ.

THE preceding observations are quite sufficient to establish the artificial structure of the Arabic Language, not merely in the formation of DERIVATIVES, but even in the formation of PRIMITIVE NOUNS. For if there were no properties common to all the primitive nouns of the Language, it would be plainly impossible to subject them all to the very same forms of inflexion ; and hence it happens, that every primitive noun is found to possess at least *three* radical letters ; this being a property common to them all, which is clearly an effect of deliberate ART.* I say, therefore, that the use of ART is coeval

* The reader knows, that some Arabic roots possess *four*, or even *five* radical letters ; but the trilateral roots are by far the most numerous in the Arabic Language, and to these, only, the observations in the text are to be considered as applicable in their full extent. A quadriliteral root admits of many forms of inflexion ; of more, indeed, than belong to the words of any other Tongue ; yet the possible inflexions of a quadriliteral root are much less numerous than those of the trilateral class, which are susceptible (as in the case of the word *فعل*) of every existing form of inflexion. A quinqueliteral root has very little variety of inflexion, but then it is generally the name of a *substance*, from which (for reasons often mentioned in the course of this work) few significant inflexions can be derived. I shall take this opportunity of stating, that there are *anomalies*, in the ARABIC as in every other Language ; and if, in the course of the present discussion, I have not thought it necessary to advert to these, it is merely because their occasional occurrence cannot possibly affect the existence of those general principles, by which the artificial structure of the ARABIC Language is established on a basis never to be shaken.

with

with the structure of the Arabic Language ; or, in other words, that there is no imaginable process of the mind, by which the Language can be traced back to a rude, uncultivated and simple state, in which the general principles of its formation were less artificial than they are now.

YET though the ARABIC and the HEBREW are but different dialects of the same Language, I see no sufficient reason to admit the inspiration of either Tongue ; *first*, because the inspiration of any Language is a fact not to be admitted, except on the clear evidence of divine revelation, such as in the present case we do not possess, and are not likely ever to obtain ; and, *secondly*, because, with all the excellence of its general principles, there are some remarkable defects in the Language, such as the intricate formation of the plural number, that seem to indicate the imperfect structure of a system otherwise possessing, in my judgment, the highest claims to intellectual pre-eminence over every other Tongue. And I am still less disposed to believe that the ARABIC, or any other human Language, is the work of Philosophers ; *first*, because there are no Philosophers in the infancy of Language ; and *secondly*, because the influence of Philosophers, when they did exist, would be insufficient to effect the subversion of the Language previously established in the country.

It remains therefore that the ARABIC Language, with all its artifice, has arisen, like other Tongues, out of the fortuitous wants of the people who speak it ; and we should next enquire how it came to pass that a system apparently founded on the most profound speculations of Philosophy has been, as it were, the result of accident ; the fortuitous consequence of unpremeditated thought !! This, however, is a subject on which I feel my inability to enlarge with any reasonable prospect of success ; and I shall therefore merely venture to state an opinion in which the reader will probably concur ;

namely,

namely, that we are naturally to look for excellence of structure in what has been termed the PRIMITIVE TONGUES.

In a patch work Language, such as the English, the unity of principle must be greatly impaired; because the resources of the Language are necessarily drawn from the incongruous structure of many other Tongues formed on various or opposite principles. There can be nothing common to all the Languages that enter into the composition of the English Tongue; and there must be much awkwardness in endeavouring to bend to the inflexions of one Language, the words originally designed for so many others. The powers of inflexion are accordingly more circumscribed in our Language, than they are found to be in most other Tongues; and the reason will be obvious to those who consider, *first*, that we have not multiplied the powers of inflexion by the system of intersecting the radical in all its points; *secondly*, that our inflexions are therefore formed on the more limited scheme of adding to the radical certain terminations; as BURN-*ing*; BURN-*eth*; BURN-*ed*; &c. *thirdly*, that the terminations borrowed from one Language, are often awkwardly applicable to the words derived from several other Tongues; and, *finally*, that this awkwardness often prevents the employment of many forms of inflexion that would be otherwise of universal application in the Language; as in the case of PALATABLE, from which very few writers would chuse to form PALATABILITY, or PALATABLENESS, though the Grammatical accuracy of these nouns cannot, I think, be reasonably disputed.

On the other hand, the unity of design will be seldom violated in the progress of any primitive Tongue; because the successive inventors of such a Tongue, happily ignorant of every foreign system of Speech, will be necessarily impelled, by the principle of imitation, to copy, in every practicable case, the established usage of their *own* Language. They
will

will not, except in cases of urgent necessity, have recourse to the adoption of new principles; and every new principle that may be adopted, will form a rule for the guidance of all future inventors. The Language, advancing in its progress to maturity, may extend indefinitely the number of its words; but these, being formed in every practicable case with reference to the same common and previously received principles, will serve merely to augment their influence. The whole structure of the Language will thus inevitably assume a systematic and harmonious form of arrangement, in which every thing appears to be the result of premeditated thought and reflexion; whereas, in point of fact, it is nothing more than the necessary and natural consequence of the principle of imitation, operating with unlimited and uniform influence on the minds of inventors ignorant of every foreign system of Speech, and therefore compelled, by a happy necessity, to shape their inventions to one common mould.*

THESE observations may serve to account for much of that harmony of structure (if in point of fact it has any existence) which I have ventured, by conjecture, to ascribe to *all* the primitive Tongues; but if we compare one primitive Tongue with another, it will probably appear that

* It follows, from what has been said in the text, that the influx of foreigners is likely to injure the purity of a primitive Tongue; because, though they may doubtless enrich it by an accession of new terms significant of ideas previously unknown to the people among whom they reside, yet those terms, being necessarily formed in a foreign mould, will be untractable to the general principles of the Language, and will destroy the harmony of structure altogether, if they shall happen to bear any considerable proportion of number to the previously existing terms of Speech. Accordingly the Arabs, who are by no means ambitious of introducing foreign idioms into their Language, though they have not been able wholly to avoid them, have resorted for the standard of its purity, not like Europeans to courts and cities, but to the heart of the DESERT, where the Language is necessarily of greater purity, because less intermixed with foreign idioms. It may be inferred from many sources of intelligence, that the poets and orators of Arabia were commonly accustomed to repair for instruction to the wandering tribes that inhabit the Desert.

some are formed on very simple principles, while others, such as the Arabic, and as I have been told, the Sanskrit also, evince the utmost possible artifice of structure that can be imagined to exist in a Language. I know not how to account for this fact otherwise than by adverting to another; *namely*, that since the general structure of one Language is often found to be wholly different from that of another, it seems to follow, as a matter of necessity, that they *must* be distinguished from each other by the simplicity or the artifice peculiar to each. For I can perceive no probable reason why two Languages, originally formed on different principles, should possess precisely the same degree of art; nor any reason, in the present state of existing Tongues, why we may not as well hope to discover the celebrated region of golden EL DORADO, as that imaginary primitive Tongue, once spoken by all mankind, which has been supposed, by some philosophers, to form the common basis of all the rest.

ADMITTING, therefore, the various structure of various Tongues, it may be expected that some will be more artificial than others; and the Arabic Language, formed on those comprehensive principles which I have endeavoured very shortly to explain, has furnished an illustrious example of the extent to which ART may be carried, in the very infancy of a primitive Tongue. For I have clearly proved that ART, in this Language, extends its influence even to the formation of primitive nouns, a fact from which it may be certainly inferred that "the use of art is literally COEVAL, or very nearly coeval with the existence of the Language, and that the latter must absolutely cease to exist before it will cease to evince the traces of art."

HAVING thus proved the artificial structure of the Arabic Language, it remains to apply the argument by analogy to the probable employment of deliberate ART in the formation of other more simple Tongues. Now the argument by analogy is obviously

obviously as strong as the nature of such an argument will admit; because it reasons from a known fact, *namely*, the highly artificial structure of one Language, to the probable employment of *some portion* of art, in the structure of others that are less artificial. And though the structure of the English Language is unquestionably less artificial than that of most other Tongues, I shall venture, even here, to brave the extent of Mr. Tooke's discoveries, in stating my opinion that the Language does in fact manifest the most obvious marks of deliberate art, in the inflexions of many of our nouns and verbs; AS GIVE and GAVE; GET and GOT; HEAT and HOT; FIGHT and FOUGHT; SHAKE and SHOOK; FALL and FELL; MAN and MEN; &c. &c.

FOR GOT is plainly an inflexion of GET, and MEN is plainly an inflexion of MAN; and though I admit the bare possibility of tracing those inflexions to some corrupted source, by the means of etymology, according to the principles established by Mr. Tooke, I am very clearly of opinion that the operations of etymology, often uncertain and perhaps erroneous, carried on too amidst the rust and obscurity of musty antiquity, and necessarily directed to the investigation of principles through the endless and very fallible medium of tracing the source of every single word, are, in their own nature, too unwieldy, and (which is of more consequence) are founded on a basis much too narrow, to warrant the establishment, on such a foundation, of any one principle of grammatical science.

ACCORDINGLY, I am not aware that any such principle, at once new and of probable authenticity, has been established by the result of Mr. Tooke's enquiries; for, though the accuracy of his etymology is admitted to be unquestionable, or at least cannot be questioned by me who am utterly unqualified for such an undertaking, I am yet warranted, by the arguments often employed in the course

of

of this work, to reject entirely, on the basis of Universal Grammar, those two leading and conspicuous principles by which he would banish from words the fluctuations of sense, and from Language the use of deliberate art!

BUT such principles are not likely to be universally applicable to *any one* Language, unless they are equally applicable to *all*; and hence it follows that the accuracy of their application to the English Tongue cannot be conceded to the force of an argument founded merely on the inference of analogy from partial evidence. Mr. Tooke may prove, but cannot possibly be suffered to assume, on defective evidence, a principle so incredible as that by which he affirms that the same English word or sound denotes invariably the same idea in every example that can be adduced; and he must also prove (since the argument by analogy is obviously insufficient to establish the *probability* of such a fact) the utter absence of deliberate art from the structure of every individual English word, (as MAN and MEN; SHAKE and SHOOK; GET and GOT; &c. &c.) that may be offered, by his adversaries, as an exercise for the display of his Etymological skill.

It is obvious to observe the extent to which those proofs must be carried, before the absence of deliberate art can be certainly affirmed of the structure, even, of the English Language; the most favorable of any, by reason of its general simplicity of structure, for the successful issue of such an experiment. They would infallibly extend through many weary volumes of tasteless ETYMOLOGY, open to the suspicion of numerous errors, and likely to escape criticism, only because the intolerable severity of such a study would repel the industry of almost every reader. So fallible, so very unwieldy, so utterly defective, according to my judgment, is the science of ETYMOLOGY, considered as

a means to investigate the nature and general principles of Speech! *

* I admit the utility of Mr. TOOKE's Etymology, and should refer to his book, in preference to every other source of intelligence, for the meaning and history of many individual English words; or indeed of every English or Foreign word which he has explained in the course of his work. As a Grammarian, too, I have the highest respect for Mr. TOOKE's talents, but none at all for his favorite science of ETYMOLOGY, considered as a guide to the establishment of general Grammatical truth. For it should never be forgotten, that the truths of General Grammar are NECESSARY and IMMUTABLE by their own nature, whereas the truths of Etymology are merely FORTUITOUS, and therefore radically unfit to furnish DATA for the establishment of any one principle of General Grammar. I shall suppose, for Example, that a given Etymological truth as the identity of the demonstrative THAT, (Give me THAT book), and the conjunction THAT (I would have you to believe THAT I would not hurt a fly; or I would not hurt a fly, I would have you to believe THAT;) has been established, by unexceptionable evidence, as well in the English, as in every other Tongue. Shall it be therefore maintained that this identity is NECESSARY or IMMUTABLE by its own nature? or shall we not rather admit that the fact, though *proved* to be true of every existing Language, is obviously FORTUITOUS by its own nature? In my opinion, it is clearly FORTUITOUS, and for this plain reason, *namely*, because it is possible to conceive the existence of some *future* Language, in which the demonstrative THAT shall be expressed by *one* word, and the conjunctive THAT shall be expressed by *another* which is neither a DEMONSTRATIVE, nor an ARTICLE, nor a PRONOUN, nor in short any thing else but a *mere* CONJUNCTION.

This consideration would be alone sufficient to destroy the NECESSITY of the identity in question, though that identity were clearly established by unexceptionable evidence, in the case of every existing Language. But if the identity be not NECESSARY, it must be FORTUITOUS, and that which is fortuitous is not a principle of Universal Grammar, which deals only in NECESSARY TRUTH. It remains therefore, that the identity of the conjunctive THAT, and the demonstrative THAT, is not a principle of Universal Grammar, even according to the liberal admission that it is positively true of every Language existing on Earth. But that which is FORTUITOUS is not likely to be positively true of every Language existing on Earth, and if I have made the admission, it is merely for the sake of argument, because I had no occasion to call in question the accuracy of Mr. TOOKE's opinion, who does not hesitate to aver its truth of all the Languages that now exist. (See DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY, VOL. 1st, PAGE 86.) The occasion however will shortly occur, and since I am not bound to prove a negative, I shall then call on Mr. TOOKE for evidence to shew the PRONOMINAL character of the Persian CONJUNCTIVE

THAT. In the mean time, I desire the reader to keep in mind the NECESSARY and IMMUTABLE nature of the truths of General Grammar, and then to point out if he can, any one truth of this nature, for which the world is indebted to the DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY. It would be in the highest degree uncandid not to admit that the work abounds in useful FORTUITOUS TRUTHS, which may be accurately applicable to many Languages, though they are not probably applicable to all.

I HAVE now shown, *first*, the highly artificial structure of the Arabic Language; and *secondly*, the insufficiency of the evidence hitherto furnished, to prove the absence of deliberate art in the structure of our own more simple Tongue. I am authorised, therefore, to assume the use of **DELIBERATE ART** as a principle applicable to the formation of Language; and to build, if possible, on that principle, an argument for the probable invention of primitive particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. Now the **ART** necessary to the invention of primitive particles constitutes, I think, the corner stone of the argument against the probability of their invention by a rude people; for if it were as easy to invent a primitive particle, as it is to invent a verb or a noun, it would be quite impossible to assign any plausible reason why those who have unquestionably invented the one, might not have invented the other also.

ACCORDINGLY, I have already erected, on the basis of the artificial structure of the Arabic Language, an argument by analogy for the probable existence of primitive particles of every species, as well in the English, as in every other Tongue; and have now only to refer the reader to that part of the introductory chapter to this volume, (PAGE 29,) which treats of particles, as contradistinguished from nouns and verbs.

IN closing these desultory observations, I think it necessary to remark, that MR. HARRIS unquestionably understood the true nature of **PARTICLES**, which he somewhere states to be **CONSIGNIFICANT WORDS**. The errors of his definition (that **PARTICLES** have no significance at all) cannot be defended, but those who read with candor, will recognise the accuracy of his ideas on the subject, and will condemn nothing but the careless inaccuracy of the terms in which his ideas are sometimes conveyed.

I NOW proceed to consider, individually, the particles employed in the Persian Language.

CHAP.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CERTAIN LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET.

THERE are sixteen letters of the Persian Alphabet, namely, ن : م : ذل : ک : ت : ش : س : ز : د : چ : ت : ب : ا : ی : و : that are found to assume occasionally a significant character. In this point of view, most of them are clearly particles, though some, as the conjunctive pronouns ت , م and ش , are apparently self-significant, and therefore not to be assigned to the class of particles. With the exception of س , ت and ل , exclusively applicable to Arabic words, and therefore of little importance to the Persian student, I propose, in this chapter, to determine as nearly as possible, the significant character of each letter ; and the uses to which it may be applied. The reader will remember the difficulty incident to the nature of the subject, and will pardon the errors into which I may be led, without rejecting, on account of these, the general arguments by which I have endeavoured to establish in Language, the existence of primitive particles as contra-distinguished from nouns or verbs. For the meaning of the particle ب , for example, may be not improbably mistaken by me ; but it would be very unreasonable to found on such a mistake, an inference to prove that *all* particles must have been formerly verbs or nouns.

ON the contrary, the accuracy of the general arguments by which I have endeavoured to establish the reverse of that proposition would remain unshaken, though it were proved against me, that I had mistaken the meaning of every individual particle in the Persian Language ; and though I do not apprehend that my errors are likely to extend so far, I am too conscious of the difficulties in the way of him who undertakes to determine the sense of primitive particles, not to apprehend that

I may be led into error. I think it necessary, therefore, to enter, *a priori*, my protest against every inference, founded on this inadmissible basis, that may be formed in prejudice to those general arguments, by which I have endeavoured to establish the existence of primitive particles. I shall now proceed to explain the use of the letter ALIF; and, for the sake of convenience, will offer such observations as occur on the subject, in the form of detached and general rules.

SECTION FIRST.

الف

RULE FIRST.

This letter may be accurately prefixed to certain particles comprising two letters; as **أ** or **ب** *With*; **أب** or **بأ** *On*; **أبى** or **بى** *Without*; &c. And in this case, it receives invariably the vowel *Futha*, having no effect on the sense of the word to which it is prefixed. Example: **تَرَكَ زَوْزًا أَبَا زَرِينٍ سَبْرًا** "The soldier of day (the Sun) advanced with his shield of gold;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

It is often prefixed, without affecting the sense, to certain P. rsian words of three or more letters; receiving, in that case, the vowel point originally applicable to the first letter, which is then rendered quiescent. Examples: *شَكَرْتُ* or *اَشَكَرْتُ* *Excellent*; *اَشَمُّ* or *اَشَمُّ* *The belly*; *اَشْرُ* or *اَشْرُ* *A camel*; &c. According to the opinion of many Grammarians, the insertion of *Alif* is here (and so also of the case stated in the first rule) a mark of the DÛREH DIALECT, as opposed to the Dialect of PERSIA PROPER, in which the letter *Alif* was commonly omitted. Be that as it may, the omission of *Alif* now generally prevails in the Language, and its insertion is of rare occurrence, except in the works of the earlier Poets.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

In the middle of a word, the letter ALIF is commonly employed to convert the third person singular of the AORIST, into what may be termed the PRECATIVE form of the verb; as, *بَوَا* or *بَا*, "May he or it be;" *رَوَا*, "May he or it go;" *مَرَوَا*, "May it not go;" &c. And it sometimes occurs, for the same purpose, before the letter م of the first person singular. Example: *بُوَسِي بَدْرَه اَي شمع که در پای تو میرام*.

"Give me a kiss, O my beloved; that I may die at your feet!" &c. It may be reckoned a pleonasm in *خَوَار* for *خور* *The sun*; *خَم خَوَار* for *خَم خور* *Dispelling grief*; *سار* for *سار* *Inverted*; &c. &c.

RULE FOURTH.

BETWEEN two nouns, it seems to indicate the relation of CONJUNCTION; and mult, in this case, be variously translated, according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. Examples: *سَرَا سَرَا* "From one end to the other;" *دَا دَا* "From head to foot;" *دَا دَا* "At every instant;"

دَوَشَاد دَوَشَس "Side by side;" *شَبَابَشَب* "Every night;" *شَبَار دَوَش* "Night and day;" *زَوَدَا زَوَد* "Hastily;" *یَا یَا* "Successively;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

AT the end of the past or present tenses of a Persian verb, the letter ALIF, then termed *اَلِیَفِ اِشْبَاع*, may be reckoned a pleonasm; being introduced by the poets, for the apparent purpose of filling up the measure of an otherwise defective verse. Examples: *مَن گفتم که بپای تو آم گشتا نخواهد زیست این* "I said, I am sick of love for thee; and she replied, this man will not live!" *دَوَر دَوَر دَوَش دَوَش* "It (the Moon) continues invisible for two days;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

At the end of a noun, it may be sometimes a pleonasm; as **زَمِينٌ يُوَسِّدُ اَزْ نُوْرٍ بِرَاقٍ** "The earth assumes a garment of light;" **خُوْشَادُوْرٍ وَبِشْ بَاكُوْرٍ اَبُوْ دَغِيْشِشْنِ اَسَاوِي** "Happy is the poor man who enjoys personal ease;" &c.* But here the letter **ALIF** is also employed for many useful purposes of speech, most of which are known to the reader; as, *First*, to form the vocative case: **يَا** "O my beloved!" **يَا لَيْلَا** "O Night-ingle!" **يَا حَسْرَتَا** "O the pity!" &c. *Secondly*, to form attributives from the **HASILE MUSDER** in the third class: (See **VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 411**;) as **كُوْشَا** "A laborer;" **رَوَا** "Current;" &c. *Thirdly*, to form the **HASILE MUSDER** of the seventh class, when added to the end of certain attributives: as **دُوْرَا** "Length;" **زُوْرَا** "Depth;" **فَرَا** "Spaciousness;" &c. *Fourthly*, to form a sort of **INTENSIVE SUPERLATIVE**: (not the vocative in all probability, since the vocative particle may be here superadded;) as **خُوْشَا** "Very happy;" **بَا** "Very much;" or **اَيُّ خُوْشَا** "O most happy!" **اَيُّ بَا** "O there are many!" &c. And, *finally*, to form, though rarely, what has been generally considered as a species of the **DIMINUTIVE** noun; though I am rather disposed to consider it as a pleonasm: as **بَا زَارِي** from **بَارِي** "A frequenter of the market;" &c. When added to the end of an Arabic noun, this letter forms the **OBJECTIVE CASE**, and the noun generally assumes the sense of an adverb: as **اِتِّفَاتَا** "By chance;" **صَلَاتَا** "In truth;" **مِثْلَا** "For example;" &c. &c.

CONCLUSION.

It only remains to be remarked, that the letter **ALIF** is not unfrequently found to assume the sound of **WAO**

* I suppose the letter *Alif* to be a pleonasm in the word **دُوْرٍ وَبِشْ بَا** for **دُوْرٍ وَبِشْ**, here used as a relative noun to signify "One of the sect or tribe of Durveishes."

MAAROF: as *مَرَمَرَمَزَنِي بُدَّةَ قَزَائِي تُوَا مَرَمَرَمَزَنِي* "For if you slay
 "me with a sword, I submit to your will;" &c. The word
قَزَائِي is here pronounced *قَزَمُوِي*, to rhyme with *رَمُوِي* &c.
 &c. which occur in the other verses of the poem. The
 straight Grecian nose, or the upright form of a Persian beauty,
 is often compared with the letter ALIF, the form of which
 is nearly straight. I now proceed to determine, as nearly
 as I am able, the significant character of the letter *ب*.

SECTION SECOND.

THE letter *ب*, as a particle, is indifferently applicable to
 nouns or verbs; receiving, in either case, the vowel points to
 be specified in a subsequent part of this chapter. As a prepo-
 sition, this letter is of course exclusively applicable to nouns;
 and is found, in this character, to indicate a considerable num-
 ber of *specific* relations, some of which are more or less obvi-
 ously distinguished from others. Now I would not be under-
 stood to affirm, that the letter *ب* has therefore any fluctua-
 tions of sense; because, on the contrary, I am disposed to
 believe, that this letter denotes some *general* relation (as that
 of APPPOSITION or CONJUNCTION for example,) under which
 all the specific relations to which I have adverted, may, per-
 haps, be accurately and reasonably comprised. But admitting
 this fact, it may yet be useful to point out the nature of those
specific relations which the letter *ب* is found to express, and
 to determine the difference existing between them; for if the
 relation signified by that letter, be of a *general* nature, it will
 be therefore applicable, (like the word *animal* among nouns,) to
 a great variety of specific relations; and these may differ
 from each other as one animal differs from another; as a
horse, in short, differs from a *man*. For though the term
 ANIMAL is doubtless applicable to a MAN or a HORSE, it is ut-
 terly incompetent to determine the specific difference between
 them; and so, also, if it be true that the letter *ب* denotes the
general

general relation of CONJUNCTION, (in other words that it may be every where translated by the word JOIN,) it still remains to determine, by adverting to the common usage of the Language, the nature of those *specific* relations that may be accurately comprised under that very indefinite and general term. But the gradations of distinction between various relations, expressed in Language by the same general term, are often exceedingly subtle and refined; inasmuch, that it is difficult to form any classification of these, that will not be open to many exceptions. For my part, I shall distinguish only the most obvious relations, including, in the same class, all those that approach so nearly together in their own nature, as to render the distinction between them doubtful or obscure.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE PROPER and the IMPROPER ZURF, as explained in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 122, of this Volume, may be accurately governed by the preposition به; which denotes, in this case, the relation known by the term ظرفیت; or that relation which exists between the verb, and the noun significant of a given *time, place, or receptacle*, in which the action of the verb may happen to occur. Examples: و نماز کن به شب "Pray in the night;" بنشین به در خانه "Sit down in the house;" "I was lost in thought;" غرق به فکر شدم "I was involved in misery;" &c. The two last furnish examples of the IMPROPER ZURF; since the words "thought" and "misery," though not properly the names of any given time, place, or receptacle, are here metaphorically considered by the mind, as a *labyrinth or receptacle*, in the mazes of which the speaker is lost.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE preposition نزد may be accurately employed to denote the relation of APPROXIMATION to place or persons, known in Grammar by the terms قرب و اتصال.

Examples:

Examples: رفتن به طبیب or, which is the same thing, ازین جا به آنجا رفتم "I went to the doctor;" رفتن ازین جا به آنجا رفتم or, which is the same thing, ازین جا تا آنجا رفتم "I went from hence to such a place;" &c."

RULE THIRD.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation of ASSOCIATION, known in Grammar by the term **مُتَعَدِّی** or **مُصَاحَبَت** as: مردم در آمیز or, which is the same thing, با مردم در آمیز "Mix with mankind;" &c. It seems to indicate the same relation, when applied to the second object of certain transitive verbs: as گفتن و شنیدن &c. Examples: با او سخنم و فرمودم or او را گفتم or بد و گفتیم "I spoke with him," or "Said to him;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation known by the term **اِسْتِعْدَانَت** "Demanding assistance;" and very commonly governs, in this case, the name of the INSTRUMENT employed in the performance of a given action. Examples: به تیغ بریدم "I cut with a sword;" بنقش نوشتم "I wrote with a pen;" شش بیکر شمع جهانی "She would flay with a glance a world of lovers;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

It seems to indicate the same relation, when employed, at the beginning of a book, to govern the name of the DEITY; &c. And, in this case, the verb آغاز می کنم "I begin this book," or any other words to the same effect, must be supplied in order to complete the structure of the sentence. Example:

۵ E

بات

بِأَمِّهِ أَنْ كَرِهْتَنِي نَامِ أَرُودِيَانَت " In the name of HIM who gave name to existence," (I begin this book) &c. And so, also, when employed elsewhere for the purpose of ADJURATION; as بِرَبِّكَ تَجَاجِبْتُ الْفَرَامِ " I adjure you by the word رَبِّكَ (I AM twice prepared to attend you) uttered by those who undertake the pilgrimage to the holy Temple;" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

It may accurately govern any given substantive noun significant of the thing by which we swear; and, in this case also, the verb is generally understood in the sentence. Example: بِسَرِّكَ لَوْ أَنَّ الْعَالَمَ بِسَرِّكَ جَمْعُ تَوْنَد " I swear by your head, that though all the world should conspire against me for the purpose;" تَوْنَانِ بَرْدَمُو آيِ تَوْبَرُونِ أَرْسِرْمَا " They will never be able to eradicate the love which I bear to you." In this case, the particle بِ is sometimes omitted; and must be supplied by the understanding of the reader: as جَانِ شِمَا وَسِرِّشْمَا جُنَانِ كُنَم " I swear by your life or your head, that I will do so and so;" &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term تَبْيِيْط. Examples: آيَا دِي مَمَكَّتِ بَارَهَاتِ اَنْت " The prosperity of a country depends on the practice of justice;" or "is obtained by reason of the practice of justice;" وَفِيْ بِرَبِّكَ نَسِ اَنْشَبِ سَمَرْنِيْ آيَد " But by reason of my evil fortune, this night will never come to an end;" &c. It may also indicate the relation signified by the terms غَايَتِ وَغَرَضِ and governs, in this case, the noun employed to indicate the END OR PURPOSE for which a given action is to be performed. Example: آيِ دُوْشْتِ بِرَبِّكَ دِنِ جَاغْظِ قَدِيْ نِه " Come, O my beloved, for the purpose of enquiring into the

the condition of HAFIZ !” This is obviously a different relation from that signified by the term **بیت**, though both may be accurately translated by the general term CAUSATION.

RULE EIGHTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation signified by the term **نقاب** or OPPOSITION; as **آسی بخر بدم و فروختم**

“ I purchased or sold a horse for money ; ” and the relation signified by the term **بدل** or EXCHANGE; as **بشادی رخ گل رخ هم زد دل برگ** “ In exchange or in recompense for the joy inspired by the blooming rose, banish, I pray you, the anguish of care ; ” &c. These two relations approach very nearly together in their own nature, and for aught I know, may, perhaps, be exactly the same.

RULE NINTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation signified by the term **شبتل** HEIGHTH or EXALTATION; and is synonymous, in this case, with the preposition **من** ON.

Example: **بکوبش زد**, or which is the same thing, **بر کوبش زد** “ He beat him against a hill, or on a hill ; ”

&c. The relation of EQUALITY, signified by the term

مساوات, is also expressed by the preposition **به** : as

بجشن و صورت او بر زمین نخواهد بود “ There is nobody on earth, equal to him in beauty and gracefulness of form ; ”

بکوبش زد که بر من به برگ کای نیست “ Let it (the harvest of my life) burn ; for in my estimation it is not worth a straw ; or equal in value to a straw ; ” &c. The preposition

به is also found occasionally to signify ACCORDING TO ; as

بس نکام دوستان منزش برار “ And then put out his brains, according to the wishes of your friends ; ” &c.

RULE

RULE TENTH.

It may be considered as a PLEONASM, before the words **بَر** and **بَغَر** as **بَغَر** ; **بَغَر** ; " Besides or Except ;" and before a noun followed by the prepositions **دَر** ; **بَر** ; **اَنْدَر** as **بَدْر يَادَر** " In the sea or the river ;" **بِهْ آبْ اَنْدَر** " In the water ;" **بَسَر بَر كَا** : **بَسَر** " On my head ;" &c. Example: **بَسَر بَر كَا** : **بَسَر** " I had on my head the crown of royalty ;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE Persian PARTICLE **بِهْ**, followed by a noun, is invariably moveable by the vowel *Futha* ; but there is an Arabic PARTICLE **بِهْ**, having the same or nearly the same sense, which is invariably moveable by the vowel *Kufra* : as **بِهْ اَلله** " By GOD ;" **بِسْمِ اَلله** " In the name of GOD ;" &c. The particle **بِهْ**, before a verb, may be often a PLEONASM ; though sometimes employed to restrict the AGENT to future time, as stated in RULE NINTH, PAGE 333, of this Volume. Before a verb, this particle receives invariably the vowel *Kufra* ; or at least, may accurately receive that vowel point, in every example that can be adduced : as **بِهْ يَكُن** ; **بِهْ يَكُون** ; &c. Yet MOWALANA SOOROOREE, the author of an Arabic commentary on the GOOLISTAH, has authorized the use of the vowel *Zumma* ; *first*, when that vowel point shall be applicable to the first letter of the verb : as **بِهْ يَكُن** ; &c. and *secondly*, when the verb shall have the labials **بَا** , **بَا** , **بَا** , or **وَاو** for the first letter : as **بِهْ يَكُن** ; **بِهْ يَكُون** ; **بِهْ يَكُون** ; &c. I am of opinion that the accuracy of the vowel *Zumma* depends on the authority of prescription alone ; whereas the vowel *Kufra* is always accurate, and therefore preferable as a rule for the guidance of those who study the Language in a foreign country. I now proceed to consider the significant character of various letters, included together in one Section, because there is not much to be said of each.

SECTION

SECTION THIRD.

ت ج د ز ر س ش ف

ت

THERE is nothing to be observed of the letter ت, which forms a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the second person; and, in that character, has already been the subject of discussion in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 65, of this Volume. It is found sometimes to be a mere pleonasm at the end of a word: as بالیس or بالشت *A pillow*; &c.

ج

THIS letter, moveable by the vowel *Kufra*, is employed, *first*, as a RELATIVE: as چه باشد میسر شودی فرست "Whatever is prepared bring it quickly;" *secondly*, as an INTERROGATIVE: as چه می گویی "What do you say?" And, *finally*, (when moveable by the vowel *Futha*.) as a termination to form the DIMINUTIVE NOUN: as باغچه *A small crow*; باغچه *A small garden*; &c. &c. In each of these characters, it has been the subject of former discussion, and need not, therefore, now occupy the attention of the reader.

د

THIS letter is the sign of the third person singular of the present tense of a Persian verb; and in that character, has been held, by most Grammarians, to be a sort of pronominal nominative to the verb: as بدید; بخورد; &c. &c. It is not unfrequently employed by the poets, as a sort of metaphorical name for the *curling locks* of a beautiful lady; though the comparison, it must be admitted, has a great deal more of absurdity than truth.

;

THIS letter has no significance, except as a contraction for **;** From, which will be treated in a subsequent Chapter of this Work.

;

THIS letter, moveable by the vowel *Futha*, and therefore followed by **هـ ي ت ح ن ف** or the gentle aspirate, is employed as a termination to form the DIMINUTIVE NOUN; and, in that character, has already been noticed in VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 437 of this Work; as **هـ ي ت ح ن ف** The throat; or A small reed; &c.

س

THIS letter is employed to restrict an Arabic verb in the AORIST, to what may be termed the PROXIMATE FUTURE, and may be accurately translated by the word SOON: as **س** "He does or will assist;" **س** "He will soon assist;" &c. Among the Poets, it forms an object to which they are fond of comparing the regular teeth of a beautiful lady: as **س** &c.

ش

THIS letter, following the vowel *Futha*, is a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the third person; and, in that character, has been the subject of our previous notice. After the vowel *Kufra*, it forms the HASILE' MUSDER of the fifth class; SEE VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 412 of this Work.

ن

THIS letter is employed, among the Arabs, for various purposes, which it is not necessary to explain here.

SECTION

SECTION FOURTH.

THE letter **ك** *quiescent*, following the vowel *Fulba* at the end of a noun, forms the *Diminutive*: (SEE VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 435,) as **اَسْبَبْ** *A little horse*; **خَرْدَكْ** *A little thing*; &c. or the *RELATIVE*: (VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 443,) as **كَاوْ** *Hollow*; **اُذْنَكْ** *An ear trumpet*; **بُشْمَكْ** *A snort jacket*; **بَدَكْ** *A led horse*; &c.

As an *INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN*, the word **ك** is noticed in CHAPTER FIFTH, PAGE 116 of this Volume; and as a *CONNECTIVE*, employed to unite the relative clause of a given sentence with its proper antecedent, it has been fully considered in CHAPTER FOURTH, PAGE 89, et Seq: to which the reader is therefore referred.

As a *CONNECTIVE*, the word **ك** is doubtless a *CONJUNCTION*, corresponding with the English Conjunction *THAT*; and is employed, in this character, for many useful purposes of Speech, besides that of connecting the relative clause of a given sentence with its proper antecedent. It is the object of the present Section of this Chapter, to determine the nature of those relations which the Conjunctive **ك** is found to denote; but before I proceed to detail the rules applicable to that subject, I think it necessary to offer a few observations on the nature of the English Conjunction *THAT*.

MR. HARRIS has stated that the word *THAT* is sometimes a *PRONOUN*; as "*THAT* is virtue;" or "*Give me THAT*;" and sometimes an *ARTICLE*; as "*THAT* habit is virtue;" or "*Give me THAT* book;" and sometimes a *CONJUNCTION*; as "*I wish you to believe THAT I would not hurt a fly*;" &c. Now it is plain that whether we say "*THAT* is virtue;" or "*THAT* habit is virtue;" the sense of the word *THAT* is precisely

precisely the same in either case; and for the reasons stated in CHAPTER THIRD, PAGE 80, of this Volume, I am disposed to believe, that in either case, the word **THAT** is truly a Demonstrative noun. At all events, it is **SELF-SIGNIFICANT**; and though certainly a *Definitive*, cannot therefore be assigned to the class of **ARTICLES**, because Articles properly so called, (as **A** and **THE**) are obviously **PARTICLES**, or **CONSIGNIFICANT** words.

THAT the demonstrative **THAT** is **SELF-SIGNIFICANT** will be admitted, I believe, by every reader; and the **CONSIGNIFICANCE** of the word **THE**, will be rendered obvious by the following consideration; *namely*, that the Substantive Noun to which it is imputed, cannot be accurately omitted in Speech. It would be nonsense to say "Give me **THE**," for "Give me **THE** book," but we may accurately say "Give me **THAT**," for "Give me **THAT** book;" and the fact, I believe, is utterly unaccountable, otherwise than by admitting the *consignificance* of the word **THE**, and the *selfsignificance* of the word **THAT**. I say, therefore, that the word **THE** is obviously a **PARTICLE**; and that the word **THAT** is *not* a Particle; and though both are properly considered as **DEFINITIVES**, they cannot therefore, on any principle, be accurately assigned to the same class of words. And though it may be maintained, for any thing I know to the contrary, that the word **THE** was selfsignificant among the **ANGLO-SAXONS**, it is easy to answer that argument simply by observing that I do not speak of its character among the **ANGLO-SAXONS**, of which indeed I have no knowledge; and that it is *not* selfsignificant now. It only remains to offer a few observations on the **CONJUNCTIVE** Nature of the word **THAT**.

Mr. **TOOKE** has clearly shewn that what has been termed the **Conjunction** **THAT** may be resolved into a Demonstrative Noun, in every example that can be adduced. His examples, indeed, are very numerous, and in my judgment quite satisfactory; but the **RESOLVING PRINCIPLE** is every where the same,

same, and two will therefore suffice here. **EXAMPLE:** "I wish you to believe **THAT** I would not hurt a fly." **RESOLUTION:** "I would not hurt a fly, I wish you to believe **THAT**." **EXAMPLE:** "Thieves rise by night, **THAT** they may cut men's throats." **RESOLUTION:** "Thieves may cut men's throats, (for) **THAT** (purpose) they rise at night," &c. &c.

Now this is not only ingenious, but in my opinion perfectly just, considered with reference to the English Language; and I admit, therefore, that what has been termed the English *Conjunction* **THAT**, is, in fact, the Demonstrative Noun (the *Article* or *Pronoun* Mr. Tooke terms it) used, however, in a conjunctive sense. And the same principle is plainly applicable to several other Tongues noticed by Mr. Tooke, who has even shewn that the Latin *Conjunction* **UT** (anciently written **UTI**) **THAT**, is a corruption of the Greek Neuter *Article* $\epsilon\tau\iota$, adopted by the Latins for this conjunctive purpose of Speech.

BUT is it not plain that all this is merely fortuitous, and not, as Mr. Tooke would have us to believe, a *necessary* principle of Universal Grammar? He desires us, on the basis of this imperfect evidence, (See **DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY**, VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 86) to examine any Language we please, in the certain expectation of discovering in them *all* "a *supposed* *CONJUNCTION*, which they employ as we do **THAT**, and which is also the *same* word as their supposed *ARTICLE* or *PRONOUN*."

Now I am unable to discover any such *Conjunction*, either in the Arabic or Persian Tongues; and, which is still more unfortunate, I cannot see the *necessity* of its occurrence in either, though I grant the *possibility* of such an event. To explain by an example. Mr. Tooke is very probably right in stating that the Latin **ut** is a corruption of the Greek Neuter *Article* $\epsilon\tau\iota$; but the evidence of the fact is to be found in the Etymological proofs which he has adduced, and

not certainly in the necessity of the case. Let us suppose the word *ut* to be *no* corruption at all, but a primitive particle, invented by the Latins for the purpose of expressing a given conjunctive sense. Is Mr. TOOKE, prepared to prove the *absurdity* of such a proposition, or the *necessity* of employing an Article or a Pronoun, and *nothing else*, to express a relation obviously Conjunctive? He has indeed shewn the *fitness* or *capacity* of the Article or Pronoun to express that relation in certain Tongues; and had the accident happened, it might, for any thing I know to the contrary, have been so employed in every Tongue. But that which *may* happen is obviously fortuitous or contingent, since the fact of its occurrence, in any given Language, must be open to the suspicion of truth and falsehood. And that which *must* happen is alone fit to be received as a principle of Universal Grammar, which (to me at least) is a word without meaning, if it deals in any thing short of NECESSARY TRUTH.

I SHALL now suppose with Mr. TOOKE, that the demonstrative *THAT* is every where employed in a conjunctive sense; and still, I affirm, that the fact is *contingent* by its own nature, and cannot, therefore, be received as a principle of General Grammar. And that which is not a principle of General Grammar, cannot be maintained of any one Language, except on specific proofs of the fact, deduced from the Language to which it relates: whence it follows, that the CONJUNCTIVE sense of the Demonstrative *THAT* cannot be assumed as a principle of Arabic and Persian Grammar, because we have not hitherto been furnished with the necessary proofs of the fact. For the Persian DEMONSTRATIVE *آن* *THAT*, can never supply the place of the Conjunctive *که*; nor can the Persian CONJUNCTIVE *که* *THAT*, supply the place of the Demonstrative *آن*. And though I admit that the word *که*, like the Latin *ut*, *may* be an ARTICLE or a PRONOUN in some Language

guage or other, I am utterly at a loss to discover the shadow of a reason why the fact is of any importance, or why, in the name of common sense, it *must* be considered as a NECESSARY TRUTH.

FOR whether true or false, the CONJUNCTIVE character of the word *ſ* will not be affected in either case ; any more than the CONJUNCTIVE character of the Latin *ut* or *uti* is affected by the fact of its derivation, or otherwise, from the Greek neuter article *ἐν*. For if I were disposed to deny the accuracy of that derivation, I might reasonably observe that the evidence adduced by MR. TOOKE, is by no means of a demonstrative or conclusive nature ; since it is supported chiefly by the similarity of sound, which might be the effect of accident alone. But in truth, the fact is so remarkably innocent of important consequences, or indeed of any consequence at all, that I am under no temptation to deny its accuracy ; and MR. TOOKE may enjoy his discovery, undisturbed by any suggestions of mine, if he will only be candid enough not to intrude it, hereafter, as a NECESSARY principle of Universal Grammar. Of this and other similar intrusions, every Grammarian has a right to complain ; for if MR. TOOKE's principles shall be finally established, there is an end to the possibility of writing Grammars, except on the abstruse, tedious, and uncertain principles of Etymological Science, in which few men living have any tolerable skill.

TO those who believe that the CONJUNCTIVE *ſ* *must* be an ARTICLE or a PRONOUN in some Language or other, I commit the care of tracing its Etymology ; and shall now proceed to detail, to the best of my ability, the nature of those specific relations, which, as a connective, this Particle is commonly found to denote.

RULE

R U L E F I R S T.

THE Particle *ک* may be accurately employed to establish the relation existing between the relative clause of a given sentence and the proper antecedent, as explained in CHAPTER 4th, PAGE 89, of this Volume. Example: *هنگامی که سنگ پرت می کند به تو شکر* " Give sugar to him who pelts you with stones ; " &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

IT may be accurately employed to indicate the relation of EXPLANATION, known in Grammar by the term *توضیح* In this case, the Particle *که* is known by the term *کاف بیانیه* and governs a sentence employed to dispel some doubt inherent in the nature of that which precedes it. The sentence following the particle *ک* may be therefore, in this case, considered as an answer to the Interrogative *What ?* Example : *بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم " I swear by humanity (What ?) that the empire of the world بزرگ داری که نمی تواند بهر زحمتی باشد بخرده شود (of what ?) that it should be purchased at the expence of one drop of blood."* The examples of this class are exceedingly numerous, and will occur to the observation of every reader. The particle *ک* is however, in this case, sometimes omitted in speech : as *رفتم به دکتر و گفتم بیمارم* " I went to the doctor, and told him (*What ?*) that I was ill ; " &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

IT may be accurately employed to denote the relation signified by the term *تعلیل* or CAUSATION ; and governs, in this case, a sentence which answers the Interrogative *Why ?* Example: *برایده رود که گذرگاه عافیت تنگ است* " Go alone (*Why ?*) because the road of safety is a narrow path ; " &c. Or the relation signified by the term *علت غایی* in which case, the sentence following

lowing the Particle **ك** will indicate the purpose to be effected by an action specified in the preceding sentence. This is but another species of CAUSATION, and the sentence following the Particle **ك** will therefore answer the Interrogative *Why?* Example: **وصِفْ وَفَاشِرْ كُنْ كِهْ تَمَنِّ مُحَمَّدٌ شَوْ** "Describe her mouth, (*Why?*) that your description may be short or small as it is." To this rule I refer the example **يَهْ رَحْمَتِ تَلَمُّذِ رَا سَمِجْ خَالِ** "Never permit the practice of tyranny, (*Why?*) **كِهْ خَوْرِشِيدِ مُلْكَتِ يَابَدَزْدَالِ** because the sun of your Empire will set;" (which is the relation signified by the term **تَقَابُلِ**;) or **كِهْ خَوْرِشِيدِ مُلْكَتِ يَابَدَزْدَالِ** "That the sun of your Empire may not set;" (which is the relation signified by the term **عِلَّتِ غَائِبِ**.) SEE PAGE 347 of this Volume.

R U L E F O U R T H.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation signified in Grammar by the term **إِضْرَابِ**, and more commonly expressed by the word **بَلِ**. The term **إِضْرَابِ** is of two kinds: *first*, **تَرْجِي** or ASCENSION; in which the second sentence forms a CLIMAX to the first: as **نَامِ حَقِّ بَرَزْدَانِ مَبِيِّ رَا مِ** "I utter the name of God with my tongue;" **كِهْ بَجَانِ وَ دَشْتِ مَبِيِّ خَوَانِمِ** "Nay, I call on him with my whole heart:" and *secondly*, **إِعْرَاضِ** or TURNING AWAY; in which the second sentence corrects an error pointed out in the first: as **خَوَانِ عَاشِقَانِ وَ تَمَنِّ بِي عَارِفَانِ** "The aspirations of men truly inspired by the DIVINE LOVE, **حَرَمِ بَهْتِ نَبِئْتِ كِهْ شَوْقِ لِقَائِ مَبِيِّ تَمَنِّ** are not directed to the joys of HEAVEN; no! they are occasioned solely by the desire of beholding THEE;" &c.*

R U L E

* THE sentiment in the text is of common occurrence among the SOOFEE POETS; and it seems to me that there is something in it to excite, at once, our admiration and pity. Their love of God is occasioned, according to them, solely by

R U L E F I F T H.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation of COMPARISON, known in Grammar by the terms *تَشْبِيْهِ وَتَمَثِيْلٍ*.

Example: *دَسْتِ چَیْنِ پِش کِه دَاوَد کِرَا* "Who supplicates thee so much as I do?" Or the relation known by the term *مُغَا جَات*, which indicates the sudden or unexpected occurrence

of a given event. Example: *باز بَدِ سُنَمَن مِی گُفْتَم کِه یَا رَم اَز دَوَرِ آه*

"I was conversing with ZYDE, when LO! my friend entered the room;" &c.

R U L E S I X T H.

It has been supposed to indicate, occasionally, the relation signified by *وَ اَوْ* *وَاَوْ* or the Conjunctive AND; though, in my opinion, it may be more accurately translated, in all the examples of this class, by the words WHILE; WHEREAS; &c.

Example: *بَسَا چَا رَه دَا نِ کُو یَه سَمِی قِی بَرُو* "Many a man possessed of resources has died in distress;" *کِه بَیْجَا رَه کُو یَه سَلَامَتِ بَیْ بَرُو* "While or Whereas or And, another apparently destitute of means, has yet borne away the ball of safety."

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It may be accurately employed to establish that relation

by the contemplation of his perfections, and is of a nature too pure and exalted to be fulfilled by the intermixture of any interested consideration whatever. On this principle, they dare to condemn the joys of HEAVEN itself, when proposed as a motive to stimulate the ardor of their devotion to HIM; just as a lover desires to convince his earthly mistress, that the fortune which it may be in her power to bestow, has no share in the disinterested ardor of his attachment to her person. So, in the following couplet, HAFIZ treats with utter contempt, the rational devotion of those among his countrymen, who are influenced, in their adoration of the SUPREME BEING, by the interested hope of eternal happiness in a future state.

تُو وَ تُو بَنِی وَا وَ قَا مَتِ بَا رِ *نَقْمِ بَرِ کَسِ بَقَدَرِ اِیْمَتِ اَوْ سَتِ*

THIS is a pitch of wild and daring enthusiasm, to which the Saints and Sectaries of modern Europe have not, I believe, hitherto reached. It would be the very acmé of impious presumption, if there could be any such thing as unintentional guilt.

which

which exists between the مُقْتَسَل and the مُقْتَسَلِ عَنِیَّة, the former being an اِسْمِ تَفْخِیْلِ in the Comparative Degree. In this case, therefore, it supplies the place of the Preposition اِز. Example: "For I have often heard from men of eminence;" کَرَمِ بَرَزگانِ شَنیدِه اَم یَز بَار بِرَوَر وِش دِیْدِه کِه بَدَلِ غَنِی "That the patience of the Poor is more meritorious (in the sight of God) than the liberality of the Rich."

RULE EIGHTH.

It may accurately govern a PARENTHETICAL sentence, comprising a prayer whether good or evil; and in this case, though perhaps not properly a PLEONASM, it is never translated into the English Language. Example: بِشَمِ بَدَانِیْدِش کِه بَر کَدِه بَاد "In the eye of the malignant or envious man (may it be torn out)" عَیْبِ مُمَايَدِ هُنَرْشِش دُر نَظَر "Excellence itself appears as a defect;" &c.

RULE NINTH.

It may govern the second member of a CONDITIONAL sentence, comprising a شَرْط and a جَزَا. Example: "If you roast me on the fire like the wood of aloes;" کَرَم چَو عَوْدِ بَر آتَشِ نِی وَ بَگْدازی کِه نَقِشِ خَالِ نِکَارَم نِی رَو دِزِ مِیْمَر "Even then, the impression made by the mole on the cheek of my beloved, will never be eradicated from my heart." In conversation, though seldom perhaps in written composition, the Particle کِه is often found to occur as a PLEONASM, between the SUBJECT and the PREDICATE of a given proposition. Example: "Zyde is avaricious, and Bukr is liberal;" زَیْدِ کِه جَبِیلِ اسْت و بُکَرِ کِه سَعِی اسْت Bukr is liberal; &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding are all the rules relating to the use and application of the Particle کِه, which I have been able to collect in

in the Persian Language; and though it has been observed that this Particle sometimes indicates the relation of NEGATION (نَقْي) or of REPULSION (تَرْوِيد) the examples of that class that have occurred to my notice, may, I believe, be more accurately comprised under the relation of the مُنْقَصِل and the مُنْقَصِل عَلَيْهِ, as already detailed in the SEVENTH RULE. Example: *بِهَ مَمَتِ ي گُوشت مَرُونِ بِهَ* "It is better to die for want of meat;" *كِه تَعَاضاي زِشْتِ قُصَا بَان* "THAN to bear the abominable dunning of the butchers."

ACCORDING to the opinion of some Grammarians, the Particle *كِه* is here synonymous with *تَوْنِ نَقْي* "It is better to die for want of meat, NOT to bear the dunning of the butchers;" and others will have it, that the example is Interrogative: "Is it better to die for want of meat, OR to bear the dunning of the butchers?" in which case, the Particle *كِه* is synonymous with *بِهَ* OR, and is supposed to denote the relation of REPULSION. The nature of the interrogation is that known by the term *اِسْتِثْنَامِ تَرْوِيدِي*; and the sense of the sentence is, that DEATH is incomparably the better choice.

It is plain, however, that this example may be accurately assigned to the Seventh Rule: "It is better to die for want of meat, THAN to bear the dunning of the butchers;" and I have not, therefore, thought it necessary to admit the opinion of those Grammarians who desire to have this and other similar examples withdrawn from the influence of that rule.

THERE are other examples in which the Particle *كِه* may appear, to a superficial observer, to denote relations not specified in any of the rules: *اَس چِه كُند شسته عَشَقَتِ كِه نَكُويد نَحْمِ دِل* "What shall the victim of your love do, IF not permitted to disclose his grief?" in which case, the word *اَكِر* IF, might (accurately as to the sense,) supply the place of the Particle *كِه*.

I conceive, however, that the particle *ش* is here used to indicate the relation existing between the **ANTECEDENT** and the **RELATIVE CLAUSE** of the sentence: "What shall the victim of love do, *who* is not permitted to disclose (or more literally, who does not disclose) his grief?" and the example is therefore accurately comprised under the relation specified in the **FIRST RULE**.

It is nevertheless possible that some of the relations expressed by the particle *ش*, may have escaped the industry of my enquiries; and that others may have been assigned to various rules, which ought to be comprised in the same rule. Nay the reader may possibly discover some *one* sense of the particle *ش*, which will be accurately applicable to every example adduced in illustration of all the rules; but even in that case, the utility of the rules will not be superceded, or even diminished in my judgment, since it is quite clear that many of the relations signified by that particle, are essentially different in their own nature, though it may be also true, for any thing I know to the contrary, that there exists in the English Language, some *one* word of a nature so very indefinite, as to be accurately capable of expressing them all.

SECTION FIFTH.

لام ميم نون
لام

THERE is little to be observed on the nature and application of the letter *لام*, which, being moveable by the vowel *Kufra*, is an Arabic **PREPOSITION** corresponding with the Persian برای **FOR**. It indicates the relation of **APPROPRIATION**: as *الْحِجْلُ لِلْفَرَسِ*, "The covering belongs to the horse;" or of **PROPERTY**, which is another species of appropriation; as

5 I

لنزید

أَمْأَلٌ لِرَيْفٍ "The money belongs to ZYDE;" &c. When moveable by the vowel *Futha*, it commonly indicates the relation signified by the term **اِسْتَعَاذَةٌ** COMPLAINT; OR SEEKING ASSISTANCE: as **يَا لَلَّهِ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ** "O God, assist the Moosulmauns!" in which, the letter **لَم** governs the name of the DEITY.

THE shape of the letters **ج** and **ل** has been the occasion of their assumption, by the Persian Poets, as objects with which to compare the curling locks of a beautiful Lady: as **اَبَفَ سَانِ قَدَرِي دَا شْتَمِ نَسْتِ عَسْمَرِي** "I had a form straight as the letter ALIF, but it is now an age;" **كِرْشِدِ دَالِ اَزِ كِرْزُفِ نَحْ لَامَتِ** "Since it has been bent into the shape of the letter DAUL, by the love of your locks, curling as LAUM." Sometimes, the names of these letters are employed as common substantive nouns, to signify the ringlets of a lady's hair.

ميم

THE letter **م**, moveable by the vowel *Futha*, is employed to form the PROHIBITIVE in the second persons singular and plural: as **مَنْعُ**, **مَنْعُوا**, &c. and the PRECATIVE in the third person singular: as **مَنْعُ**, **مَنْعُ**, &c. In this case, the first letter of the verb may be optionally rendered quiescent, if not followed by a quiescent letter: as **مَنْعُ** or **مَنْعُ**, and will continue to be moveable by its own proper vowel point, if the second letter of the verb shall not be moveable: as **مَنْعُ**, **مَنْعُ**, &c.

AT the end of a CARDINAL NUMERAL, the letter **م** forms the ORDINAL: as **چهارم** Fourth; **بشتم** Twentieth; &c. And

at

at the end of certain nouns, (probably Turkish,) it forms a mark of the feminine gender : as **نِسِير** "A gentleman;" (literally "Chosen" or "Selected;") **نِسِيرَم** "A Lady;" **بَيْت** "A Lord;" **بَيْتَم** "A Lady;" &c.

At the end of a verb, it forms the pronominal nominative of the first person : as **گفتم** "I said;" or, more rarely, the accu-

fative or object to the third person : as **برایانم** ; **برایانیت مرا** ;

"He excited me;" &c. After nouns, it forms the conjunctive personal pronoun of the first person : as **برادرَم** "My brother;" **یارَم** "My friend;" &c. or a contracted form of the verb **ام** : as **چهارم و چاکرم** "I am a servant;" &c.

THE shape of the letter **م** (or rather of its head) has furnished the poets with an object to which they are fond of comparing the small and pretty mouth of a beautiful woman.

THE letter **ن** is a NEGATIVE PARTICLE ; as **نَرَفْت** "He did not go;" **نَرَوَد** "Let him not go;" &c. When combined with **می**, it is commonly prefixed to that particle; as **نمی رَوَم** : but sometimes, though rarely, is observed to follow it : as **تو که بر زبان می بنایی نموش** "If you find no filk, be silent nevertheless."

It has been observed by some Grammarians, that there is a difference of sense between the examples **می نکنم** and **نمی کنم** ; **می نکرَدَم** and **نمی کردَم** ; &c. the former being employed to denote

denote what has been termed *التنقي أو الشنير* "The negation of the continuative sense implied in the particle *می*;" and the latter being employed to denote what has been termed *إشتمار التثني* "The duration of the negative sense implied in the use of the negative particle." In this case, *نمی دیدم* signifies "I did not *continue* to see;" and *می ندیدم* signifies "I continued *not* to see;" but there is not, I believe, any foundation in the common usage of the Language, for this refined distinction of sense, and both examples may be therefore considered as entirely synonymous in every respect.

THERE is little to be observed on the use and application of the NEGATIVE PARTICLE to the purposes of Speech. It must be generally repeated before the second of two nouns, or of two verbs, connected together by a copulative conjunction: as *زید نخورد و نخوابید* "ZYDE neither ate nor slept;" *نه مصر و نه آفریقا مانند روم* "Neither will Egypt nor Europe nor Turkey remain;" &c. But in the case of two nouns, the negative particle is sometimes omitted before the second: as *چون حسن عاقبت نه بر بدی و ز ابدی است* "Since future happiness depends neither on profligacy nor on devotion," (but solely on the inscrutable dispensations of God;) &c. When the negative particle is not followed by a verb, it often supplies the place of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION, which may be elegantly omitted, though often inserted, in such cases: as *نه زید آمد نه قر* "Neither is ZYDE come nor is AMR;" *زید نه شاعر است و نه عالم* or *زید نه شاعر است نه عالم* "Neither is ZYDE Learned, nor is he a Poet;" &c.

THE letter *ن*, following the vowel *Futba* at the end of a word, is employed, *first*, as a mark of the INFINITIVE: as *نگزیدن*; *مردن*; *کردن*; &c. *secondly*, to form the RELATIVE NOUN:

NOON: (SEE VOL. I, PAGE 444) as *ثَقِي* *Thick lipped*; *زَبَن* *Filthy*; &c. *thirdly*, to form a *رابط*, OR MARK OF CONNECTION, analogous to the nature of our substantive verb: as *زَبَدَنُ خُشَن* "ZYDE is pleased;" a form of construction which is now become obsolete: and, *finally*, as a PLEONASM in certain Examples: such as *پاداشش* for *پاداشش* *Retribution*; &c.

ANY thing crooked may be compared to the letter *ن*: as in the following example, extracted from an amusing Satire on Human Life, in which the actions of all mankind are ascribed, universally, to the love of money.

خوش نویسی که شب و روز گشت مشغول
 تا با ستوب نویسد همه حریت موزون
 گر دانش داند و سرش داد و تش گزد و تون
 و دیده اش صا دو بش میم و دانش مگر دوتون
 این همه از بی آن است که ز رمی خواهد

I SHALL not venture to translate these verses, but it may be necessary to inform the European reader, that the author means to describe the severe labour of the *KUOSH NÜVSES*, (a man whose profession is that of writing in a very fine hand;) and this he has done by exhibiting the attitude in which he writes, in a manner at once lively, forcible, and ludicrous even for its very absurdity.

SECTION SIXTH.

وا و ا و ا
 و ا و

THE letter *وا*, moveable by the vowel *Fathá*, is one of the

5 K

ترو ت عط

حَرْفِ عِلْفٍ : “ A copulative conjunction,” signifying AND. In common Language, as well as in poetry, it generally assumes the sound of the vowel *Zumma*, applicable to the last letter of the word which precedes it: as زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرٌ آمَدَا “ZYDE and AMR came.” After a word ending in *هَيَّ* مُخَفَّفٍ, or in ALIF or WAW quiescent, it commonly assumes the sound of *هَيَّ* مُخَفَّفٍ or the *soft Humza*, moveable by the vowel *Zumma*: as تُوُّوْ تَوْبِي “You and the tree *Tooba*,” سَيْبُهُ وَبَاوُ وَنَسْتُ “The breast, the hands, and the feet;” &c. In prose at the beginning of a sentence and elsewhere, or in poetry when the measure of the verse may happen to require it, the letter و, must receive the vowel *Futha*.

THE use of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION *وَ* *وَاطِفَةٌ* seems to be that of JOINING TOGETHER two or more nouns substantive or adjective; or two or more verbs; or perfect propositions; as زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرٌ آمَدَا “ZYDE and AMR came;” زَيْدٌ عَالِمٌ وَشَاعِرٌ “ZYDE is learned and a poet;” زَيْدٌ آمَدٌ وَنَثَسْتُ “ZYDE came and fat down;” زَيْدٌ آمَدٌ وَعَمْرٌ رَفَتَ “ZYDE came and AMR departed;” &c. Of the nouns, verbs and perfect propositions, thus joined together, the first is termed *مَعْلُوفٌ تَائِبٌ* “The thing with which something else is joined;” and the second *مَعْلُوفٌ* or “The thing joined with something else.”

In the case of a negative sentence, the NEGATIVE PARTICLE must be generally repeated before the *مَعْلُوفٌ*: as نَهْ زَيْدٌ عَالِمٌ اَنْتَ وَنَهْ عَمْرٌ “Neither is ZYDE learned nor is AMR;” زَيْدٌ نَحَرَ وَدُوْنُوْهُ اَيْدٌ “ZYDE neither ate nor slept;” &c. And the reason is obvious, since the non-repetition of the negative particle would leave the sentence doubtful or obscure. For the negation of a *whole* proposition is equally obtained

obtained by the negation of *any* or of *all* its parts, and hence it follows that the phrase "ZYDE and AMR did not come" (زید و عمر نیامدند) is equally true; *first*, when either came but not the other; and, *secondly*, when neither the one nor the other came. And on the same principle, the phrase "All this is not true" involves a palpable obscurity; because it means that "A PART OF THE WHOLE is positively false;" but whether A PART OF THE WHOLE cannot be determined, otherwise than by the aid of the context alone. For if a *part* be false, it is very plain that "all is not true;" and if *the whole* be false, it is equally plain that "All is not true;" or in other words that "The whole is false." I say, therefore, that the phrase زید نه عالم و شاعر است or زید نه عالم و شاعر نیست "ZYDE is not learned and a poet," (and so also of every similar example) involves an obvious obscurity; *first*, because it may signify that "ZYDE is neither learned nor a poet;" and, *secondly*, because it may signify that "He is not learned, though he may be a poet;" or that "He is not a poet, though he may be very learned." And the repetition of the negative before the *مَقْلُوب* is plainly intended to dispel this obscurity; because the phrase زید نه عالم است و نه شاعر will necessarily signify that "ZYDE is neither learned nor a poet," and cannot possibly have any other sense.

THAT the obscurity inherent in the nature of all such phrases is common to the English, as well as to the Persian Language and to every other Tongue, must, I think, be sufficiently obvious from the following examples: "ZYDE and AMR did not come, but ZYDE came alone;" "ZYDE is not learned and a poet, but he is very learned, though he is not a poet;" &c. Whence it may be inferred that the principle on which the obscurity depends; *namely*, that "the negation of a given proposition is equally obtained by the negation of any

any or all its parts," is essentially true in the nature of things, and consequently a principle of General Grammar.

I SHALL now proceed to offer a few rules (not very important) for the use and application of the particle **وَ** **وَاوِ عَاطِفٌ**, or the conjunctive **AND**. I admit that this particle has no *real* fluctuations of sense, and suppose, on Mr. Tooke's principles, that it may be always accurately translated by the words **ADD** or **GIVE**; though the former is probably the better term. To this general sense of the word **AND**, every reader will be easily able to refer the *seeming* fluctuations in the sense of this particle, that are noticed in some of the following rules.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE particle **وَ** is very frequently employed to indicate the relation known by the term **مُلازِمَت**, "The constant conjunction of two or more objects;" and more commonly expressed by the preposition **بِ** **WITH**. In this case, the verb is usually and elegantly omitted in speech. Examples: **تُوْ وَ مَدَّ كَامَرَانِي وَ نَشَاطُ وَ خَاطِرُ خَرَم** "You are destined to every species of happiness;" **مَنْ وَ شِكْنِي وَ مَدَّنَا تَوَانِي وَ دِلِ بِرُغْصَم** "And I to misery, wretchedness, and a heart full of grief!"

R U L E S E C O N D.

It has been supposed to indicate the relation signified by the term **تَبَاقُل** or **CAUSATION**, when employed to connect the **دَلِيل** and the **مَدَّ تَوَل**; "The proof with that which is to be proved." Example: **وَرَمْتِي رُغْصَمُ عُسْرِ عَزِيزَتِ سَلَامَن** "In the desire of beholding her countenance, your life, O SÜLMAUN!" **بِهَ كَرَانِ آمَدُ وَ هَرُ جِسْتِ كَرَانِي دَارَد** "Has verged to a close, and truly such is the fate of sublunary things!"

R U L E T H I R D.

It may be accurately employed to connect the **حَال** with the

the ذوالحال (See RULE 5th, of the Chapter that treats of the حال) when the former happens to be a perfect sentence. Example: قریباً دس زکاریم گز و دُون گزشت و نیست "My wailings have passed through the vaulted heavens, yet have they not the power of doing injury to this threshold;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may be accurately employed, like the particle **إِ** Or, to detail the subordinate species comprised in the sense of some general term: as **كَلِمَةٌ اِسْمٌ اَوْ فِعْلٌ اَوْ حَرْفٌ** "A word is either noun, verb, or particle." Or to signify the relation known by the term **اِبَاحَتٍ** RENDERING LAWFUL: as **زُنْشِنِ بَا زِيْدٍ وَعَمْرٍ** "Sit down with ZYDE or AMR;" that is to say, "with both or either." Or the relation signified by the term **تَقْيِيْنٍ** GIVING A CHOICE: as **قَبِّلْ وَجْهَكَ بِمَا تَبْتَغِي** "Embrace (at your choice) banishment or captivity." Or the relation signified by the term **اِنْ اَسْبَ وَهَرَارٍ** or **رُفْقَةٍ** مُبَابَعَتٍ **مِي كَتَمُ** or EXCHANGE: as **اِنْ اَسْبَ وَهَرَارٍ** "I will sell this horse for a thousand rupees." Or to form what has been termed the **عَطْفِ تَقْيِيْنِي** in which the **مَعْلُوْفٌ** and the **مَعْلُوْمٌ** are both significant of the same, or nearly the same idea: as **اَوْفَاقٌ وَوُجُوْهٌ** "Friends and relations;" **كُوْنُفَةٌ وَتَجَرُّدٌ** "The corner of solitude and loneliness;" &c. Or as a **PLEONASM** before **اِ**: as **اِذَا بَرَزْنَا نَرَى اَنْفُسَنَا** "We shall see whether the horse of ISFUNDIAR **سَوِيْ غَاثَهُ** will return home without his rider;" **وَاِذَا بَرَزْنَا نَرَى اَنْفُسَنَا** "Or whether the horse of the warlike Roostum **اِذَا بَرَزْنَا نَرَى اَنْفُسَنَا** will return home without his master;" that is to say, "We shall wait to see whose lot it is to fall before the prowess of the other," &c.

RULE FIFTH.

THE CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS of the Persian Language cannot be followed by the particle **و** **و**, and must be therefore superceded, in the case of its occurrence, by the DISJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS. Examples: **زَدَم تُو را و زید را** never **زَدَم تُو را و زید را** " I struck you and ZYDE ;" **گفتم او را و بکر را** never **گفتم او را و بکر را** " I spoke to him and BUKR ;" **آدم من و زید** never **آدم من و زید** " ZYDE and I came ;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

If the **مَعْلُوفٌ عَلَيْهِ** shall be two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, the governing noun must be repeated in the **مَعْلُوفٌ**, if its repetition shall be necessary for the purpose of dispelling an obscurity in the sentence. Example: **چاکر تُو و چاکر بکر** " Your fervant and the fervant of BUKR." The words **چاکر تُو و بکر** would signify " Your fervant and the person named BUKR ;" or perhaps " The joint fervant BUKR and you."

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE nothing more to observe on the nature of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION, which may be accurately omitted in prose or in verse, for the sake of the measure, or for the purpose of adding to the melody of a period: as **جَنَف جَزْد و رَنج بی و فانیانِ نربانِ سُخنی** &c. The verb also, being expressed in the **مَعْلُوفٌ عَلَيْهِ**, may be accurately omitted in the **مَعْلُوفٌ**, which is the common practise of ancient writers: as **فیلسوفان ویر و دیر خورد و عابدانِ رنم سیر** " Philosophers eat after long intervals, and devotees with great moderation ;" or it may be (and very commonly is) reserved by modern writers, for the last of a long series of propositions, connected together

together by the copulative conjunction. Nay, it very often happens, in such examples, that the verb understood, varies in each member of the sentence: in which case, it must be significant of some general idea, such as may be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader. In the following example, extracted from the " History of NADIR SHAH," a work celebrated for the multiplicity of such omissions, the verbs understood are inserted by me between parentheses.

مَرَكِبِ ابْنِغَارِ رَايَزْتَمَك (مَرَكَبُ) وَدَرِيكُ شَبِ اَزْ نِطَامِ دَارِدُ
 كَتَبَ رُوْدِ اَنَرَك (كَتَبَ) وَفَوَّجِ اَزَانِ سَرُوْدِ بَدَرْكَ رَا
 مَرَقَضَهْ بِلَارَكِ سَاقَتَهْ دَارِدُ اَسْرَابَادُشَهْ نَدُ

" Having given speed to the horse of haste, he marched, in one night, from NEZAUM to the banks of the ATRUG, and putting to the sword a squadron of that infamous tribe, he then entered the city of ISTRABAUD."

It only remains to be remarked that the letter *و*, *quiescent*, at the end of a word, is sometimes a mark of the RELATIVE: (VOL. FIRST, PAGE 444) as *أَيُّ* " A water lily;" *لَيْلَى* " The night mare;" &c. and sometimes, though rarely, a mark of the DIMINUTIVE: (VOL. FIRST, PAGE 437) as *بُتْرُو* " A little boy;" *بُتْرُو*, " A little girl;" &c. In the Arabic Language, the letter *و*, is sometimes prefixed to the noun by which we swear: as *وَاللَّهِ* " By God," *وَرَأْسِ النَّبِيِّ* " By the head of the Prophet;" &c.

‡

THE letter ‡ is one of the *حُرُوفِ نَسْبِي* or RELATIVE PARTICLES: and, in that character, has already been the subject of discussion in VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 444 of this Work. Like all the relative particles, it denotes an INDEFINITE RELATION, which may yet become SPECIFIC in any given example, by the arbitrary authority of prescription alone. Examples: *دَسْمَهْ* or *قَبْلَهْ* " A handle;" *زَبَانَهْ* " Flame;" or " The tongue

tongue of a balance ;” **وَزَنَ** “ The asthma ;” or “ A pair of bellows ;” **مَزْزُوزٌ** “ Daily ;” **وَزَامٌ** “ Wages paid by the month ;” &c. &c.

WHEN added to the **HAUSILÉ** MÜSDER of the 2d Class, (See VOLUME I, PAGE 410,) it forms the **PAST ACTIVE PARTICIPLE** ; or the **SIMPLE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE** : as **مَرْمُتٌ** “ Having slain ;” or “ The person slain ;” **مَرِيدٌ** “ Having seen ;” or “ The object seen ;” &c. Or, in the case of a neuter verb, it forms a simple adjective noun : as **مَرْمُتٌ** “ Asleep ;” **مَرْمُتٌ** “ Dead ;” &c. the latter, as well as the former, being a simple adjective, not a participle, according to the opinion of Eastern writers, because it denotes the **EXISTENCE** of **DEATH** in a given object or substantive noun. The letter **ت**, occurring in this situation, may be also a **PLEONASM** : as **زَيْدٌ آمَدَ** or **زَيْدٌ آمَدَ** “ ZYDE is come ;” **زَيْدٌ كَسَى رَاكُنَةً** or **زَيْدٌ كَسَى رَاكُنَةً** “ ZYDE has slain somebody ;” &c.

AT the end of a noun, it may be sometimes a **PLEONASM** : as **أَنْبَانٌ** or **أَنْبَانَةٌ** “ A granary ;” &c. or it may be employed, merely, as an instrument for the enunciation of the vowel **Futha**, when that vowel point happens to be applicable to the preceding letter : as **خَامَةٌ** “ A pen ;” Plural **جَامَةٌ** “ A garment ;” Plural **جَامَتَانِ** ; &c.

THE letter **ل** is of two kinds, **مُتَرْوِفٌ** و **مُتَجَهِّزٌ** ; and both are employed for various useful purposes of Speech, most of which are known to the reader. It will be sufficient therefore, at this period of his progress, to offer a cursory sketch of the use and application of this letter, considered under each of the two characters which it is found to assume. The details will be found in various parts of this Work, to which I shall here have occasion to refer.

THE

بای منصوف

THE letter **وَف** بای منصوف, at the end of a Persian verb, forms the pronominal nominative of the second person singular: as **آیدی** ; **رُفتی** ; **روی** ; **نیري** &c. and after **ه** or the gentle *Aspirate*, is converted into **ه**, or the termination **ای** as **گفته** ; **گفته** ; **گفته** ; otherwise written **گفته** ; **گفته** ; **گفته** &c.

AFTER an Arabic noun, it sometimes forms a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the first person singular: as **مُشْفِقِي** "My friend;" or "O my friend!" **مُکْرِمي** "My benefactor;" **الهي** "My God;" or a mark of the **مُبْلَغ** or INTENSIVE SUPERLATIVE: as **اتَمَرِي** "Most exceedingly red;" **عَلَامِي** "Most exceedingly wife;" and other examples of the same nature. After the name of a TRIBE or a NATION, it restricts to UNITY the sense of the primitive: as **رُومِي** "The Romans;" **عَرَبِي** "The Arabians;" **عَرَبِي** "An Arabian;" &c.

AFTER a Persian Infinitive, it generally indicates the relation signified by the term **لَيَاقَت** or FITNESS: as **گفتنی** "Fit to be spoken;" **کردنی** "Fit to be done;" &c. Example: **دَر کَارِ بَادِه کُوشِشِ کَرِی اَسْت کَرْدَنِي** "Persist in the habit of drinking wine, for that is an action fit to be done;" &c. After Arabic and Persian Adjectives and Epithets, and after many Substantive Nouns, it forms the HASILE MUSDER of the FIRST CLASS: being subject, in that case, to the permutations detailed in the rules for the formation of that Noun: (SEE VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 405, ET SEQ.) Examples: **نِیبِي** "Goodness;" **مَظْهَرِي** "Wisdom;" **عَاقِلِي** "Knowledge;" **دَانَايِي** "Evil;" **بَدِي** "Oppression;" (in a Passive Sense) **بَايِي** "Humility;" from

پای "The foot ;" حانمی "Generosity;" from حانم The proper name of a man ; &c.

AFTER many Arabic and Persian nouns, it forms one of the **حُرُوفِ نَسْبِ** or **RELATIVE PARTICLES**: and in that character has been fully considered, with all its permutations, in the **FIRST VOLUME**, **PAGE 247** and **445**, to which the reader is therefore referred. Or it may form the **SUBSTANTIVE VERB** in the second person singular: as عَلَیْ "You are a slave;" جَارِکِ "You are active;" &c. and in this case will be changed into *Humza*, after the gentle aspirate, or the letter **یا**: as کَرِ "Who are you?" رَجُ "What are you?" نِ "You are not;" آدَمِ "You are a man;" &c. Example: رَوِ که چنان نازک و موژوَن نِ "Go! for you are not so very handsome."

پای مجہول

THE letter پای مجہول, at the end of a Persian Verb, is employed to form the **CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE** in three of its persons: as کَرْدَمِ, کَرْدِی, کَرْدِی; &c. In this case, it indicates, *first*, the duration of a given event for some definite or indefinite period of past time: as زَبَدَمِ رَوِ زَنَدَمِ آمَدِی "ZYDE continued to visit me daily;" or, *secondly*, the feelings of desire or regret, occasioned by the occurrence or otherwise of a given event: as کاش کَر سَعَادَتِ شَهَادَتِ دَرِ یاقَتَمِ "Would that I had obtained the happiness of martyrdom!" or, *finally*, the mutual dependence on each other, at some period of past time, of two events connected by the relation of **CAUSE** and **EFFECT**: as اَسْخَرِ زَبَدَمِ سَبَابِ آمَدِی مَن تُو دَرِ یَقَتَمِ "If ZYDE had not come,

come, I would have gone;" &c. (See the CHAPTER that treats of the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE.)

At the end of a Generic Noun, the letter **بای مخجول** forms the INDEFINITE ARTICLE, as already explained in the Chapter that treats of GENERIC NOUNS. In this character, it has sometimes the force of **بای شکیر** or, *the Indefinite Ya*; as **کتابی از کتب خانه بیار** "Bring me a book (no matter what book) from the library;" and sometimes the force of **بای وحدت** or *Ya of Unity*; as **شبیهی تا روز خفته بودم** "I slept one night until morning;" &c.

The letter **بای شکیر** is rhetorically employed for various useful purposes of Speech: as, *first*, to indicate the relation of SIMILITUDE, known in Grammar by the term **مُشَابَهَت** as **آن دم که با تو باشم یک سال هست روزی** "In your presence, a year is as a day;" or, "passes away with the rapidity of a day;" &c. or, *secondly*, to denote VENERATION OR CONTEMPT, known by the terms **تَعْظِیم و تَخْفِیر** as **زید مردی است** "ZYDE is a man;" that is to say, "He is eminent for all the qualities that may become a man;" **آن جا رفتم و چیزی یافتم** "I went thither and obtained something;" that is to say, "a mere trifle;" &c.

AFTER **بای مخفف** or the *Gentle Aspirate*, the letter **بای شکیر** is changed into *Humza*: as **بندو** "A slave;" **دیوانه** "A madman;" &c. and after the PROPER NAMES of men celebrated for a certain attribute, it converts these into EPIETHES significant of such attribute: as **فرعون** "A PHAROAH," or "proud

“proud man;” *خاکی* “A HAUTIM,” or “liberal man;” *تبا جی* “A HUDJAUJ,” or “tyrant;” &c. It may occur between a given substantive and the following attributive which is imputed to it: as *مردی عاقل* “A wise man;” but if the attributive shall form a perfect sentence, the particle *که* must then be superadded: as *چشمی که ندیده باشد* “An eye which has not seen you;” &c. It may also follow the *منقول* *مطلق* for the purposes stated in treating of that noun: as *به پیمای پیوونی باوه چش* “Measure out wine in several measurements;” or it may be a PLEONASM after *فلان* as *خوبی آنست و کانت که فلانی دارد* “That only is beauty and grace, which is the portion of such a person;” &c.

THE vowel *کره* of the *مضاف* or *موصوف*, may be lengthened in poetry into the sound of *یا*, in order to fill up the measure of a verse: as *رخسبت و دوران رسد روزی بپایان غم محبور* “Be not grieved, since the evils of fortune will one day cease;” *دل شکسته که در زلف سرگشت بستم* “My broken heart, which I bound in the ringlets of your curling (refractory) locks;” &c.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF PERSIAN PARTICLES AND OTHER WORDS COMPRISING MORE THAN ONE LETTER.

IT is my intention, in this Chapter, to consider in the order of Alphabetical arrangement, the remaining particles of the Persian Language; omitting those only which have been fully explained in some preceding part of the work, and embracing certain other words, such as *Yes* or *No*, which appear to me to be self-significant, and therefore not to belong to the class of particles. With regard to the true character of these two words, I can hardly venture to offer an opinion. They may have

have been originally verbs or nouns, according to the system maintained by Mr. Tookz ; but admitting the fact, they have ceased, I conceive, to be verbs or nouns, without acquiring the character of particles, and cannot *now* therefore be accurately comprised under any one of the three parts of speech.

It seems to me that these two words bear the same relation to a sentence, which a pronoun bears to its noun of reference ; for if we answer YES or NO to a man who has occasion to ask a question, we affirm or deny the sense of the question, and therefore each of these two words does in fact comprize in itself the force of a whole proposition to which it refers, and of which it is employed to supply the place. There are, I believe, in every Language, a few other words of doubtful character, the nature of which may furnish some reason to suspect that the triple division of words into NOUNS VERBS and PARTICLES is really imperfect ; embracing indeed the far greater part of the materials of every Language, but not absolutely including the whole. I now proceed to consider, in their order, the particles and other words which are to form the subject of the present Chapter.

SECTION FIRST.

لِ / WITH.

THIS is another form of the word ل, and it is difficult to determine which of the two is the source of the other. Those who argue in favor of لِ / observe, that it is more consistent with the common usage of every Language, to diminish than to augment the number of letters that may have originally belonged to any given word. Those who maintain the opposite opinion, consider that لِ / is seldom used, but by the ancient Poets, who may have found it often convenient to form لِ / from ل, in order to fill up the measure of a verse. Both denote the relation of ASSOCIATION, known in Grammar by the terms **بَيْنَتٌ وَمُصَاجَبَتٌ**. Example:

5 N

لِ /

آبَانِزَه وِزِجُوشَن كُزَار " With spears and arrows penetrating armour;" &c.

اَبَر on.

This is another form of the words اَبَر, and both denote the relation of EXALTATION, known in Grammar by the term اِسْتِعْلَاء. Example: اَبَر شَادِي اَبَر تَخْتِ زَرِيْن نِشْت " He sat down with joy on his throne of gold;" &c. The word اَبَر seldom occurs, except in the works of the older Poets.

اَبِي WITHOUT.

This is another form of the word اَبِي, and is of rare occurrence, except in the writings of the ancient Poets. Being opposed, in point of sense, to the word اَبَا or اَبَا With, it denotes the absence of that relation signified by the terms اَبِي. Example: اَبِي اَو بَا شِيم دُرُزَم شَاد " We are unwilling to fight without him;" (Roostum;) &c.

اَخِر AT LAST.

This is an Arabic word formed on the measure اَفْعَل, and signifies THE LAST or LATEST, as opposed to اَوَّل, Measure اَفْعَل, commonly used to signify OTHER; LATTER; &c. The word اَخِر, is therefore an active participle or an adjective noun, as اِيْن كِتَابُ اَخِر دِيْد " This book is finished;" اَخِر دُرُزَم اَز اَنجَا بَر اَمَم " I left that place at the close of day; &c. It is adverbially used by the Persians, to signify AT LAST: as اَخِر اَز هَذِهِ اِيْنِي نَرِيْس " You that practise so much tyranny! have you no fear of the wrath of God?" &c. The sense of the word اَخِر disappears in my translation, but the force of that word will be easily intelligible to those who understand the true meaning of the sentence, which is

is as follows. " There are many reasons against the practice of tyranny, such as the infamy of its commission, the desolation it occasions, and the feelings of detestation excited by it; but overlooking all these, I ask you AT LAST, or as the LAST and STRONGEST of these reasons, have you no fear of the wrath of God? a motive against the practice of tyranny, so powerful as to supercede the necessity of stating any other." It is plain, therefore, that there is an ellipsis in every sentence of this nature, and that the word *آخر* so used, implies the omission of all INFERIOR reasons, for the sake of the LAST or STRONGEST of them all. It belongs, not to the verb *می ترسی* " Do you not fear AT LAST the wrath of God?" but to another verb understood in the sentence; such as *بگوئی آخر* " Tell me " at last," or any other words to the same effect.

اَیْذُونْ اَیْذُونْ THUS and THUS.

THESE two words are of rare occurrence in the Language, being commonly superceded by the more familiar phrase *چنین و چنان* " Thus and thus;" with which, indeed, they are exactly synonymous. Example: *تنگتر کن نو آند ر جاست شاهین و مرغابی* " Reflect on the nature of the hawk and the wild duck;" " *نکوئی کز چه معنی راست این اَیْذُونْ و آن اَیْذُونْ* " You cannot tell why either has been created such as he is;" or " Why the one has been formed to prey on the other," &c. The sense of the words *اَیْذُونْ* might be otherwise expressed *کز برای چه معنی* " For what end;" or " For what purpose," whence it follows that *اَیْذُونْ* is here used in the sense of the word *برای* For.

اَر IF.

THIS is merely a contraction of the word *اگر* If, the nature of which will be shortly explained. It seldom occurs, except in poetry, and then only in the middle of a line, where it

it may coalesce with the particle *و* And, forming in that case, the word *وَر*. Example: *بنای که محکم نہ اَر و اساس*

"The building which is not strong in its foundations," *بلند شش مائے ورنکی زوہراس* "Raise it not high, or if you do, fear that it will tumble into ruin." At the beginning of a line, the word *اَر* (another contraction of *اگر* If,) commonly supercedes the word *اَر*.

اَرَنگ APPARENTLY.

I BELIEVE this to be another form of the word *اَرَنگ*, *Color*. It has many acceptations which will be found in the Dictionary, but the following example from RODRIGUEZ will explain the only sense in which it requires to be noticed here. *ہرگز ننگد سوتی من خستہ نگاہ* "She never deigns to cast an eye on her wretched lover;" *اَرَنگ نخواہد کہ شود شاد و ایمن* "APPARENTLY she has no desire to render me happy." Some people here translate the word *اَرَنگ* by *ہرگز* Never: "She NEVER desires to render me happy:" but if it be another form of the word *اَرَنگ*, I conceive the former translation to be the more accurate.

آری YES.

THE word *آری*, though nearly synonymous with the word YES, has an acceptation somewhat more extended than that of the corresponding English word. It is employed for various purposes of Speech: as, *first*, to confirm the sense of any given proposition, whether affirmative or negative, that may have been uttered by another speaker. Examples: *زید آہ* "ZYDE is come;" to which the person addressed may answer *آری* YES; or *آری زید آہ* "Yes, ZYDE is come." Or in the negative: *زید نیامد* "ZYDE is not come;" to which the answer may still be *آری* YES; or *آری زید نیامد* "Yes, ZYDE is not come;" &c. It is plain, therefore, that the word *آری* may

may be employed to confirm the sense of any proposition, whether in the affirmative or negative form: whereas the word YES will necessarily *destroy* the negative, because it is not good English to say, "Yes ZYDE is *not* come;" the word YES being here generally superseded by NO. The difference between the word آری and the word YES, consists therefore in this: that the former may coalesce with a negative sentence, which is not generally true of the latter: and this difference cannot be affected by any change in the form of the proposition, which may be INFORMATIVE, as in the preceding examples: OR INTERROGATIVE, as آيا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" Answer: آری NO: OR IMPERATIVE, as شراب بنور "Drink wine;" Answer: آری YES: OR PROHIBITIVE, as شراب مَنور "Do not drink wine;" Answer: آری NO: &c. &c.

BUT, *secondly*, the word آری like the word YES, may be accurately employed to *destroy* the negative comprised in any given proposition: as آری آمد "Yes he is come;" in answer to the words زید نیامد "ZYDE is not come;" or آيا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" &c. &c. How then are we to determine whether the word آری destroys or confirms the negative contained in any given proposition, to which it may happen to be uttered as an answer? The resolution of this question is simple and easy. We must repeat the proposition in every doubtful case: as آری آمد "Yes he is come;" in answer to the question آيا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" &c. In either sense of the word آری, the proposition will, in fact, be generally found to follow that word; but in the event of its omission, the word آری will confirm, and cannot destroy the negative or affirmative form in which the proposition may have been first uttered. The word آری, standing alone, must be therefore translated by YES or NO, according to the

5 O

affirmative

affirmative or negative sense of the sentence to which it may be uttered as an answer.

It only remains to be remarked of this word, that it may be accurately employed as a mere corroborative, like the word TRULY in our Language: as جَشِيمَ كَرِيَانِ خِيَالِي مَدْحَانَ دَارِ دُرُ أَشْكُ

"The streaming eyes of KHIALEE are destroyed by his tears;"

مِي شُدِ آدِرِي ز بَارَانِ غَايَةِ مُرْدُمِ خَرَابِ "Yes truly, the habitations of men are destroyed by the rain!" That it may also

corroborate a negative sentence, the following example will sufficiently evince: زَنَادَرِازِ عِشْرَتِ رِنْدَانِ نَصِيبِ نَبِيتِ

"The devotees have no share in the joys of the dissolute;" (such is the literal signification of the word رِنْدَ which here and elsewhere very commonly implies the SOOFIES, or those who are devoted to the love of God;) آدِرِي هَر كَسِي نَدِيدَنْدِ اِيْنِ نَوَالِ رَا

"True, every man is not destined to partake of those joys!" &c.

از FROM.

It is peculiarly worthy of remark, that the Arabs have two prepositions, مِنْ FROM; and عَنْ FROM; both of which are translated by از. Yet these two prepositions are not at all synonymous; nay, they are so completely distinguished in point of sense, that the use of either to supply the place of the other, though not wholly unknown to the Language, must be considered as a rare occurrence. The word عَنْ cannot be accurately employed for مِنْ, in the phrase سَرْتُ مِنَ الْبَصْرَةِ إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ "I travelled FROM Busrāh to Koofa;" nor can the word مِنْ supply the place of عَنْ, in the phrase رَمَيْتُ السَّهْمَ عَنِ الْقَوْسِ "I threw the arrow FROM the bow;" &c. In what, then, consists the difference of sense

sense between these two prepositions, both of which are commonly translated by the same word, as well in the Persian, as in the English Tongue?

We are told by the Arabian Grammarians that the word **مِنْ** denotes the BEGINNING OF A SPACE; (**اِبْتِدَاءِي غَايَت**) being directly opposed, in point of sense, to the word **إِلَى** To, which has been found to indicate the END OF A SPACE; (**اِنْتِهَائِي غَايَت**). Whence it follows, that the preceding example, **سَرْتُ مِنَ الْبَصْرَةِ إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ**, " I travelled from Busrāh to Koofa," might be thus rendered: " I travelled BEGINNING Busrāh; END Koofa;" or, in other words, that the Arabian Grammarians have assigned to the word **مِنْ**, the very same sense which Mr. Tooke ascribes to the word FROM. I believe, accordingly, that the word FROM is entirely synonymous with **مِنْ**, not **عَنْ**; yet **عَنْ** is very generally translated by FROM, as in the Example **رَمَيْتُ السَّهْمَ عَنِ الْقَوْسِ** " I threw the arrow FROM the bow," &c. Two questions occur, therefore, with regard to the nature of this example. *First*, it may be reasonably asked why the example cannot be accurately rendered in Arabic by the word **مِنْ**? and, *secondly*, what is the true meaning of the word **عَنِ**, by which alone it can be accurately rendered?

Now the word **مِنْ**, like the word FROM, is significant of the same idea with the word BEGINNING; and since the example in question is rendered in English by the word FROM, " I threw the arrow FROM the bow, or BEGINNING the bow;" I can see no reason why it might not be accurately rendered in Arabic by the word **مِنْ**. But we know that it cannot be so rendered, and in the absence of every better reason, I am compelled to account for the fact by a reference to the idiom or

or common usage of the Language, which here proscribes the use of **مِنْ**. I admit however, that this is a very lame account of the matter, a sort of cabalistical resource to which the Grammarian, in his utmost perplexity, may be sometimes, though rarely, permitted to refer.

It remains to determine the true meaning of the word **عَنْ**, which is certainly not synonymous with **مِنْ**, or even with **FROM**, though both are often translated by **FROM**. The word **عَنْ** denotes the relation of SEPARATION, known in Grammar by the terms **انْفصال** و **تجاذز**, and seems to be exactly synonymous with our **OFF**. The phrase **رَمَيْتُ السَّهْمَ عَنْ الْقَوْسِ** means, therefore, "I threw the arrow **OFF** the bow;" and as the word **مِنْ** cannot here supply the place of **عَنْ**, it follows that the use of **FROM**, in the example before us, is peculiar to the idiom of the English Language, and wholly inconsistent with that of Arabia. To this diversity of idiom in the two Languages, the common translation of **عَنْ**, which signifies **OFF**, by the word **FROM**, which has a different sense, must, I believe, be invariably ascribed. I now proceed to consider the nature of the Persian preposition **از** **FROM**.

I HAVE no doubt, that this preposition has the double force of **عَنْ** and of **مِنْ**; and it is certain, at least, that there is no other word by which either preposition can be accurately translated into the Persian Tongue. It has the sense of **مِنْ** in the following example: **از زَنْجُ تا فرنگ سیر کردم** "I travelled **FROM** Ethiopia to Europe;" or "I travelled **BEGINNING** Ethiopia, **END** Europe;" but it is somewhat more difficult to shew its application in the sense of the preposition **عَنْ** **OFF**. The example **بَرِ آرز کمان آنداختم** "I threw the arrow **FROM** the bow," will be obviously insufficient for that purpose: *first*, because

because ; *ā* is here commonly translated by FROM ; and, *secondly*, because FROM is synonymous with *مِنْ* not *عَنْ* . We must therefore endeavour to find another example of a less questionable nature, and the following, I believe, will answer the purpose.

بِذِكْرِ حَسَبِ آرزو جان مُشْتَبَلِ سَعْدِی

“ Wholly occupied by the contemplation of the DEITY, they are utterly careless of all the world !”

It is to be observed that the word *مُشْتَبَلِ*, in the example before us, is obviously connected with two prepositions: *بِذِكْرِ حَسَبِ مُشْتَبَلِ* “ Occupied by the love of the DEITY,” *آرزو جان مُشْتَبَلِ* “ They are careless of the world ;” &c. Now the word *مُشْتَبَلِ*, abstractedly considered, signifies OCCUPIED, not CARELESS ; yet it must be generally translated by the word CARELESS, when followed in Persian by the preposition *آز*, or in the Arabic Language by the word *عَنْ* . And the same effect may be observed to flow from the use of these prepositions, in combination with many other Arabic and Persian words: as for example ; *بِکارِی پُر دَاخِشَمُ* “ I engaged in a certain affair ;” *آز کارِی پُر دَاخِشَمُ* “ I disengaged myself from the same affair ;” *دُورِ آن رَغَبْتُ کَرْدَمُ ; رَغَبْتُ فِیْهِ* “ I desired this ;” *آز آن رَاغِبُ شَدَمُ ; رَغَبْتُ عَنْهُ* “ I did not desire it ;” &c. &c.

It is true, indeed, that the preposition *آز* is not invariably expressed in every example of this nature: yet I remember no instance of its omission, except in the case of the verb *خَالِدِ* as *پُر دَاخِشَمُ* “ I emptied the house ;” and there I presume it might be supplied : *خَالِدِ رَا از خود پُر دَاخِشَمُ* “ I emptied or disengaged the house from myself ;” in which case,

case, it may be accurately considered as underflood in the sentence.

Now I ask the reader how it happens that the Persian *آز*, or the Arabic *مَعَى*, is able to produce the effect to which I have just adverted, of reversing, apparently, the ordinary signification of the words with which they are here combined? And to this question, I conceive it is impossible to return any other than the following answer: *namely*, that both are here properly translated by *OFF*: that neither does, in reality, alter the ordinary sense of the words with which they are here combined: and that the phrase *آز کار می برداشتن* (and so also of other examples) signifies "To engage *OFF* an affair;" which is the same thing as "To be disengaged from it." It is on this principle that we say in English (though the expression is merely colloquial, and may perhaps be accounted vulgar:) "He wished to engage me in a long argument, but I *FOUGHT OFF* ; or, in other words, I would *NOT* fight the argument with him." The following is a summary statement of the inference to be drawn from these observations.

LET it be granted that the radical signification of the words *آز*, *مَعَى*, *برداشتن*, *راشتن*, *برداشتن*, &c. is precisely the same in every example that can be adduced; and we must then admit, on the evidence of the preceding examples, that the Arabic *مَعَى* signifies *OFF*, and that the Persian *آز* is found occasionally to have the same sense. And this I contend to be much more reasonable than the other alternative, which requires us to believe that each of these words, combined with the prepositions *آز* or *مَعَى*, is, in reality, significant of the idea *directly opposed* to that which it is known to signify in every other case. To those who embrace the second alternative, who believe that the word *برداشتن*, abstractedly considered, signifies at once *DESIRE*, and the contrary, (and so also of the other

other examples,) I admit my inability to furnish any demonstrative evidence of the fallacy of their opinion; or, in short, any arguments on the subject stronger than those already adduced. I believe, however, that those arguments will be deemed sufficient, by the reflecting reader, to justify the conclusion drawn by me: *namely*, "that the word می signifies FROM; that the word عی signifies OFF; and that the Persian از has the joint force of the other two."

I NOW proceed to detail the rules for the practical application of the word از to the purposes of speech; having first premised that though I believe the general sense of از to be such as I have stated, I will not undertake to reconcile to that general sense every possible example of its practical use.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE word از is very commonly employed to indicate the separation of a PART from the WHOLE, signified in Grammar by the term تَبْطِيقٌ TO DIVIDE, OR TO SHARE. The word تَبْطِيقٌ is derived from بعض SOME, which may, in this case, supply the place of the preposition از. Examples: "از نصایح محکماتست هر چه دیگر نباید دل بستگی را نشاید" It is an observation, or among the observations, or a *part* of the observations of the wise, that nothing is valuable which is not lasting; "قناعت و عفت از سیمیه تر زین است" Contentment and purity are among the number of laudable qualities;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

IT is very commonly used to indicate the relation of EXPLANATION, known in Grammar by the term تَبْطِین. In this case, the preposition از must follow some general term, denoting an idea which is to be defined, or rendered specific by means of one or more following substantive

substantive nouns. Examples: **آنجے فرمودی از زجر و ملامت** "The reproaches uttered by you," or more literally, "What you said consisting of reproach and censure;" **آنچه مناسب حال از باب ممت نیست** is not consistent with generosity of spirit;" or "Does not accord with the usual conduct of generous men." Of this nature are the examples: **خانمی از طلا دارم** "I have a gold ring;" **جامهای قیمتی از پشمینه و اطلیس خدای خریدم** "I purchased valuable robes, consisting of woollen, and the silk of Khūta;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

It may be employed to denote the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the terms **تعلیل و سببیت**. Example: **مملکت آزاد آبادان شود** "A country flourishes by the means of justice;" &c. Or the relation signified by the term **تبادل** or EXCHANGE: as **این اسب را از زر خریدم** "I purchased this horse for money;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may indicate the relation signified by the term **اِستِیْنَات** AID OR ASSISTANCE; and will govern, in that case, a given substantive noun significant of the MEANS OR INSTRUMENT employed in the performance of a certain action. Examples: **از قلم نوشتم** "I wrote with a pen;" **نان از علمای خویش خوردم** "I earned my bread by my own industry;" &c. Or the relation signified by the term **اِستِیْلَا**: in which case, it is convertible with the preposition **بر** ON. Example: **از کوه بر آمد**; or which is the same thing, **بر کوه بر آمد**. "He ascended the mountain;" or **از نفس خود دین می کند** or **بر نفس خود دین می کند** "He is parsimonious even to his own person;" or "He practices parsimony on his own person;" &c.

RULE

R U L E F I F T H.

It denotes the relation signified by the term **Distinction**; and will occur, in this case, between two nouns directly opposed to each other by sense. Example: **مگر کسی خاک مرده باز کند** "If a man were to uncover the ashes of the dead," **شناسد تو نمک از در و بش** "He would perceive no distinction between the poor and the rich;" or "He would not know the rich as distinguished from the poor."

R U L E S I X T H.

It supplies occasionally the place of the preposition **IN**; denoting, in that case, the relation signified by the term **Place**. Example: **پایانده را یاد کرد از نخست (در نخست) ظرفیت** "He thought on God, or addressed himself to God in the first place. Or the place of the word **بعد** **AFTER**: as **آدم از چهل روز گرد تمام (بعد چهل روز)** "The Adcem (a species of scented leather) is prepared or becomes perfect in the course of forty days; or *after* forty days;" &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It denotes the relation of **APPROPRIATION**, signified in Grammar by the term **تخصیص**, and commonly expressed by means of the **IZAFUT**, as already stated in the Chapter that treats of the **GENETIVE CASE**. Example: **سپاس از خداوند خورشید و ماه** or, which is the same thing, **سپاس خداوند خورشید و ماه** "All praise is due to the Lord of the Sun and the Moon;" &c. Of this nature are the examples **فیش از ان**; **س از مدتی** &c. &c. where **از** supplies the place of the **IZAFUT**, according to the opinion of all Grammarians.

R U L E E I G H T H.

It may be employed, like the English word **THAN**, to

form the link of connexion between the مُفَصَّل and the مُفَعَّل كَلْبَه; the former being an adjective in the comparative degree. Example: زید بهتر از عسراست "ZYDE is better than AMR;" &c. (SEE CHAPTER ELEVENTH, PAGE 276 OF THIS VOLUME.)

R U L E N I N T H.

It will be found, occasionally, to indicate a variety of other relations, the classification of which, I am compelled to abandon to the judgment of the reader. Examples: (گفتی را می شنیدم) "I asked a philosopher;" "Let every man give alms in his own behalf;" "I found no traces of any body;" "I went on business to a certain place;" &c. In the last example, and in many others of the same nature, the word اَز may be considered, I imagine, as a mere PLEONASM.

R U L E T E N T H.

THE word اَز, in the following example, performs a double office: *first*, it forms a component part of the complex term اَز خاطر و در قش "To lose one's mind;" or "To be wholly absorbed in the contemplation of the DEITY;" and, *secondly*, it forms a connective equivalent to the word THAN, between the مُفَصَّل and the مُفَعَّل كَلْبَه. Example: "There is no happiness greater than that of him who is absorbed in the contemplation of God." The sense of the example might be thus expressed: اَز خاطر و در قش و بی خود شدن و دلنی توهر ازین نیست; whence it is obvious that the word اَز, being once expressed, is afterwards omitted to avoid repetition.

CONCLUSION.

IT is a remark of Mr. TOOKE (*DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY, VOL. I, PAGE 346.*) that Dr. JOHNSON has numbered up *twenty* different meanings of the word FROM, to which he has super-added *twenty-two* other modes of using that word; supporting his opinion of its versatile character by a phalanx of examples amounting to the number of SEVENTY or more. Yet Mr. TOOKE truly affirms that the word FROM has but one sense; *namely*, that signified by the word BEGINNING; which may invariably supply the place of FROM, in every example that can be adduced.

Now it was certainly the duty of Dr. JOHNSON to have ascertained, if possible, that general sense of the word FROM, for which we are indebted to the discoveries of Mr. TOOKE; but admitting that he had successfully performed that duty, it would be still necessary to illustrate, by a variety of examples, the practical application of that word to the purposes of speech. For the simple statement of the fact, that the word FROM signifies the BEGINNING, will not enable a man who is imperfectly versed in the common usage of the English Language, to determine the individual cases or propositions in which that particle may be accurately employed; and the reason must be obvious to those who duly appreciate the arbitrary influence of IDIOM, which unquestionably determines, in conjunction with the literal meaning of every word, the propositions to which it may be applied. To explain by examples.

THEY say in Persian *آز قلم نوشتم*; which is translated into English "I wrote *with* a pen;" and so, also, they say *زید بهتر از عمر است* "ZYDE is better *than* AMR;" where *از* is translated by the word THAN. Now we cannot say in English that "ZYDE is better FROM AMR;" or even that

“ZYDE wrote FROM a pen;” yet this is what the Persians say, since the word ;ِ, abstractedly considered, is properly translated by the word FROM. I ask, therefore, why both particles, being, as they are, synonymous terms, are not found to be invariably applicable to the same propositions? or in other words, why a Persian may accurately employ the word ;ِ in the same proposition which cannot be accurately rendered in English by the word FROM? The answer is obvious: *namely*, because the practical application of synonymous terms varies with the idiom of every Language; and as the operations of idiom are certainly arbitrary, it thence follows, that every Grammarian is bound to perform a double duty: *first*, to determine, with Mr. TOOKE, the true meaning of the word of which he has occasion to treat; and, *secondly*, to illustrate, with Dr. JOHNSON, (that is to say, by a variety of well chosen examples,) the practical application of the same word, as determined by the IDIOM of the Language to which it belongs.

THIS is the plan which I have hitherto pursued, and shall continue to pursue, in treating the particles of the Persian Language; and though, ignorant of Etymology, I must be sometimes in danger of falling into error, I shall have performed an acceptable service to Grammatical Science, if I can shew my successors, in distant perspective, the cheering prospect of future emancipation from the trammels of Etymology imposed by Mr. TOOKE. Not that I condemn the aid of Etymology, which unquestionably furnishes the best means to determine the meaning of individual words; but unfortunately, we cannot always have recourse to its aid, and, following the plan of the Arabian Grammarians, I aspire to demonstrate, in such cases, that the truth is attainable by other means.

Of the word ;ِ I have nothing more to observe, except that the letter *Alif* is sometimes omitted in writing, as كَرِ; زَرِ; نَرِ; for كَرِ; زَرِ; نَرِ; &c. and that the letter ;ِ, moveable

by the vowel KŪSRA, is often employed for ; ا, in order to preserve the measure of a verse.

اَزِيرِ Because.

THIS word is generally contracted into اَزِيرِ, and sometimes into اِزِرِ by ancient writers. It is probably a complex term, consisting of the three words: اَزِينِ or اَزِيرِ اَيْنِ "For this reason;" in which case, the word ا, must be considered as a mere pleonasm. Admitting the accuracy of this etymology, which the reader will adopt or reject at pleasure, it follows that the letter Noon, of the word اَيْنِ, must have been rejected in process of time. It is generally followed by the particle اِزِرِ (اَزِيرِ اِزِرِ) but in poetry that particle is sometimes omitted, as for example: اَزِيرِ اِنْ اِزِرِ اِنْ غَمِّ تَكْدِدِ "Let not your heart indulge in grief; اَزِيرِ اِنْ اِزِرِ اِنْ غَمِّ تَكْدِدِ "Because grief is not diminished by indulgence." &c.

SECTION SECOND.

اِزِرِ.

MR. TOOKE states that the word اِزِرِ, anciently written اِزِرِ, is another form of the word اِزِرِ, which may always supply the place of اِزِرِ, in every example that can be adduced. Example: "If you beat me, I shall beat you." Resolution: "Give, you beat me, I shall beat you." Example: "Nay further, yet, they make her go,—In doubting if she doubts or no." Resolution: "Give she, she doubts or does not doubt, to this extent they make her carry her doubts;" &c. Now I admit the accuracy of this etymology, which is at once plausible, and well sustained by a variety of examples and illustrations adduced by Mr. TOOKE. And the admirers of that eminent

writer have discovered in the word **اِزَّ** GRANT, or more literally, TAKE, the fancied origin of the word **اِزَّ**, which is another form of **اِزَّ** IF.

I HAVE already assigned some reasons (VOLUME II, PAGE 51.) why the accuracy of this etymology does not command my implicit faith: *first*, because I am not aware that **اِزَّ** was anciently employed for **اِزَّ**, as **اِزَّ** was anciently employed for IF; *secondly*, because **اِزَّ**, being merely poetical, is obviously a contraction of **اِزَّ** IF; *thirdly*, because it does not appear that the letter *Alif* was ever prefixed to the Imperative **اِزَّ**; and, *finally*, because **اِزَّ** with *Kufra*, not **اِزَّ** with *Fulha*, is the most natural and analogous contraction of **اِزَّ**; as may be observed on reference to other inflexions of the verb, such as **اِزَّ**; &c. On the other hand, I think it probable, on Mr. TOOKE's principles, that the words GIVE or GIVEN, GRANT or GRANTED, TAKE or TAKEN, &c. &c. may always supply the place of IF, in every example that can be adduced; and if the reader shall be therefore of opinion that **اِزَّ** is a corruption of the verb **اِزَّ**, he is at liberty to determine the question according to the dictates of his own judgment, without regard to my incredulity, or that of the learned Native Grammarians with whom I have had occasion to converse on the subject. It remains to determine (if indeed I am able to determine,) the nature of those propositions to which the word **اِزَّ** may be accurately applied.

THE word **اِزَّ** is one of the **اِزَّ**; A CONDITIONAL PARTICLE, so called, because it must be generally followed by **اِزَّ**, or CONDITIONAL SENTENCE consisting of two members, *namely*, the **اِزَّ** or CONDITIONAL MEMBER, and the **اِزَّ** or CONSEQUENCE flowing from the **اِزَّ**.
Example:

Example: اگر کار کنی مزد داری " If you work, you shall obtain the reward of your labor;" &c. It is most naturally employed in cases of DOUBT, as in the preceding example; being opposed, in this respect, to the word **هنگام** WHEN, which is generally employed in cases of CERTAINTY. Example:

هنگام صبح بدند ازین جا کوچ کرده آمد " When the morning breaks, (an event obviously of certain occurrence,) we shall march from hence;" &c. So far, it corresponds exactly with our IF; the simple unaccompanied utterance of which, will often excite the idea of DOUBT; as for example: "If! thou protector of this damned trumpet, talk't thou to me of ifs?" &c. Yet both are often rhetorically employed in cases of CERTAINTY, and I shall have occasion, in the course of the present chapter, to point out some of the principles on which the accuracy of such application seems to depend,

EVERY sentence following the word اگر If, is not properly a conditional sentence; for, on the contrary, that word is often rhetorically employed to elevate into energy, the expression of some UNCONDITIONAL proposition comprised in the second member of the sentence by which it is followed: as for example:

اگر به من مایل و اگر من را بکشد " If you are favorable to me, or if you put me to death," ما بستمه ایم و مصاحبت ما رضای توست " I am

still your slave, and your approbation is the only object to which I aspire." It must be obvious to the reader, that the poet's devotion to his mistress is here represented as wholly unconditional: it has no dependence whatever, on the mode of conduct that she may think proper to adopt towards him, and will subsist equally under the opposite extremes of favor and discouragement on her part. For a CONDITION, properly so called, indicates the terms on which a given event can alone take place: "If you do your work, (but not otherwise,) I shall handsomely

handsomely reward your labour;" and according to the Arabic aphorism, إِذَا بَيَّنَّ الشَّرْطُ مَا تَلْتَمِشُونَ, "When the **شَرْطُ** is lost, so is the **مَشْرُوعُ**," the absence of the condition implies the absence of the **مَشْرُوعُ**, or "That to which the condition was annexed."

Now a poet might certainly make the *favor* of his mistress, the **CONDITION** of the continuance of his devotion to her; but it is not in the nature of things that any man should bespeak the *cruelty* of his mistress as a condition, the non-adherence to which, on her part, would have the effect of putting an end to his admiration. And hence it follows, as already stated, that the preceding is not properly a conditional sentence; the word **إِذَا** being here and elsewhere very commonly employed, on rhetorical principles, to elevate into energy the expression of a given proposition comprised in the **جُزْءِ**, or second member of the sentence by which it is followed. Of this employment of the word **إِذَا** I shall shortly have occasion to speak more fully than is necessary in the present stage of the discussion.

EVERY CONDITIONAL SENTENCE must have a reference to past or future time; and though the English *If*, and the Persian **اِذَا**, are indifferently applicable in either case, (" If you beat me, I shall beat you;" " If you had beaten me, I would have beaten you;" &c.) the Arabs have invented two particles, *namely*, the word **لَوْ**, and the word **إِن**, (both translated by **اِذَا** *If*,) the one applicable to past time, and the other applicable to future time. I deem it necessary, therefore, to offer a few observations on the nature of these two Arabic particles.

THE Arabian Grammarians have entertained opposite opinions with regard to the true meaning of the word **لَوْ**; but the point of

of difference must be considered as of little importance, notwithstanding the nice and metaphysical arguments employed by the writers on either side of the question. The facts of the case are shortly as follows. The word **لَوْ** is very rarely applicable to any proposition having a reference to future time, though some few examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language, such as **اَطْلُبُ الْعِلْمَ وَلَوْ بِالْيَمِينِ** "Pursue knowledge, even if your pursuit should extend to CHINA;" where **لَوْ** occurs in the sense of **اِنْ**. Generally speaking, it must be followed by two verbs in the past tense: **لَوْ زُرْتَنِي اَكْرَمْتَك** "If you had visited me, I would have received you with honor;" and though the first verb may be sometimes, though rarely, observed to assume the form of the Aorist, it must be still translated by the past tense, since the phrase **لَوْ تَزِدُونِي اَكْرَمْتَك** is precisely equivalent to the phrase **لَوْ زُرْتَنِي اَكْرَمْتَك** "If you had visited me, I would have received you with honor;" &c.

In reality, therefore, the word **لَوْ** denotes the NEGATION of both members of the sentence by which it is followed: for if it be affirmed that "If you had visited me, I would have received you with honor," the speaker obviously means to assert that "the visit in question did NOT take place, and that therefore he did NOT receive you with honor." This is the true criterion by which to determine the proper application of the word **لَوْ**; for, if the sentence cannot be so transposed, the word **لَوْ** will not be employed; as in the phrase: "If they have done this deed my Lord," where the word **اِنْ** must be rendered in Arabic by the word **اِنْ**.

So far, the Arabian Grammarians are unanimous in the opinion which they have formed of the true meaning of the word **لَوْ**, but the events comprised in either member of the

sentence by which it is followed, are connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT: "BECAUSE you did not visit me, THEREFORE I did not receive you with honor," and hence a question has arisen among them, the object of which is to determine whether **لَوْ** denotes the negation of the CAUSE, which implies the negation of the EFFECT; or, vice versa, the negation of the EFFECT which implies the negation of every possible CAUSE. It is unnecessary to detail the fine spun arguments employed by the champions on either side of this very unimportant, nice and metaphysical question; and I proceed, therefore, to consider the true nature and meaning of the word **لَوْ**.

THE proper application of the word **لَوْ** may be easily inferred from the preceding observations on the true meaning of the word **لَوْ**. It is applied, in the sense of IF, to every proposition which cannot be accurately expressed by means of the word **لَوْ**; and though commonly applicable to future time, it seems, (apparently at least, if not in reality,) to have an occasional reference to past time. Example: **لَوْ قَتَلَ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا وَاجَبَ قَتْلًا**: "If ZYDE slew AMR, he ought to suffer death;" &c. Now the word **لَوْ** cannot be accurately employed in this example, because there is here no negation of the propositions comprised in either member of the sentence; and the speaker, on the contrary, professing his utter ignorance of the guilt or innocence of the accused party, means, simply, to state an opinion that "In the event of his guilt, he certainly merits the punishment of death."

THE use of the word **لَوْ** for **إِنْ** would therefore alter the sense of the whole sentence: **لَوْ قَتَلَ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا وَاجَبَ قَتْلًا**: "If ZYDE had slain AMR, he would *then* have merited the punishment of death;" and here the negation certainly holds, because the sense of the phrase is clearly equivalent to the
statement

statement of an opinion that "ZYDE did NOT slay AMR, and therefore did NOT merit death." And if we insert a negative in both or either member of the sentence, "If ZYDE had NOT slain AMR, he would NOT then have merited death," the word **لَوْ** will be still employed; and as two negatives make an affirmative, the sense of the sentence will then run thus: "Because ZYDE slew AMR, therefore he did, in reality, merit death."

Now if it be true that the phrase **اِنْ قَتَلَ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا وَجَبَ قَتْلُهُ** implies a reference to past time, it must be inferred that the Arabian Grammarians have mistaken the true nature of the word **اِنْ**, which is affirmed by them to be exclusively applicable to future time. But the second member of the sentence "ZYDE merits the punishment of death," contains an opinion expressed by the speaker; and that opinion is not POSITIVE, but merely CONDITIONAL, because he is ignorant of the guilt or innocence of the accused party. What then is the CONDITION on which the speaker declares the accused party to be worthy of death? I answer, that it is not simply his guilt, but the *knowledge* of his guilt, on which an opinion of that nature can be accurately formed; for though he may be guilty in point of fact, it is wholly impossible that I can declare him to be worthy of death, unless his guilt shall be known to me. I conceive, therefore, that there is an ellipsis in every sentence of this nature: "If it shall be proved to my satisfaction, or to the satisfaction of others in whom I have confidence, that ZYDE slew AMR, then I say that he is worthy of death;" and, in this case, the Arabian Grammarians may possibly be right in the opinion which they have stated, that the word **اِنْ** is properly restricted to future time.

I ADMIT however, that the fact is of little importance, and the reader will therefore determine the question according to the dictates of his own judgment; observing, merely, that the word

word **ان** is supposed to indicate "The mutual dependence, on each other, of two future events comprised in either member of the sentence by which it is followed:" or to speak more accurately, "the dependence of one event upon the other;" as for example: **ان جئتني اكرمك** "If you visit me, I will receive you with honor;" where both verbs, though verbally put into the past tense, must be translated by the future tense. It remains to offer a few observations on the nature of this dependence, which is supposed to exist, or to have existed, between the two members of every conditional sentence, whether following the word **ان** or the word **لو**.

THE events comprised in either member of the sentence are most commonly connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT; as it happens in the phrase **اكر آفتاب بر آید روز موهو شود** "If the SUN shall arise, the day will appear;" where the rising of the SUN is properly the **سبب** or true CAUSE of the appearance of day. But if, for this example, we substitute the phrase **اكر زر بدست آید اسب بخرم** "If I obtain money, I shall purchase a horse," it must be obvious to the reader, that the **سبب** or true CAUSE of the purchase of the horse is to be found in the convenience which I expect to derive from the services of that valuable animal, and the acquisition of money is not, therefore, the CAUSE of the purchase, but merely the **شرط** or CONDITION, without which it cannot be carried into effect. And if we reverse the first example:

اكر روز موهو شود آفتاب طالع گردد "If the day shall appear, the SUN will arise," the appearance of day will neither be the CAUSE, nor even the CONDITION of the rising of the Sun, but simply the EFFECT of the presence of that Luminary, who is himself the parent of day.

It is plain, therefore, that the relation existing between the two members

members of a conditional sentence is merely that of the DEPENDENCE of one proposition on the other, or most commonly of MUTUAL CONJUNCTION; whence it happens that the **شَرَط**, or First member of the sentence, is known to Logicians by the term **مَلْزُوم**, or "Thing accompanied by something else;" and the **جَزْأ** or Second member of the sentence, by the term **مُزِم**, or "That by which the **مَلْزُوم** is accompanied." But the examples of the third class (**اِذَا كَرَّرْتُ زَمَّوْجُوْهُ وَشُدَّ اَنْفَسَابُ طَالِعِ كَرْدُوْ**) will be found, I believe, to be of rare occurrence in every Language; and, generally speaking, it may be accurately affirmed that the relation existing between the **شَرَط** and the **جَزْأ** is properly that of CAUSE and EFFECT; the term CAUSE being understood to extend to the **شَرَط**, as well as the **سَبَب**, according to the preceding explanation of those very accurate and logical terms. And this relation of CAUSE and EFFECT must be generally supplied by the understanding of the reader, wherever it is not expressed in terms; as for example: "If you are a warrior, I am no coward;" a phrase which implies a long ellipsis: "Do not believe that you can intimidate me, for if you talk to me of your warlike exploits, I desire to inform you that I am no coward;" &c.

I SHALL now proceed to illustrate, by a few rules and examples of no great importance in my own eyes, the practical application of the word **اِذَا** If; but this word, having the double force of **لَوْ** and of **اِنَّ**, it will be seldom necessary to notice the distinction of sense existing between these two Arabic Particles, and I shall therefore consider the word **اِذَا** as having the same sense, (which is probably the fact,) whether applicable to past or to future time.

RULE FIRST.

THE verbs comprised in either member of a **CONDITIONAL SENTENCE** following the word **اگر** *If*, and having a reference to future time, will generally assume the form of the **AORIST**, or **FUTURE TENSE**. But I have shewn on a former occasion, (**VOLUME II, PAGE 340**) that the **PAST** and **PRESENT** tenses of the verb may often supercede the future tense, in the case of a Conditional Sentence having a reference to future time. Example: **اگر رفتنی بریدی و اگر نخفتنی مریدی** "If you go on, you are safe, but if you sleep, you die;" &c,

RULE SECOND.

THE word **اگر** *If*, is most naturally employed in cases of **DOUBT**; but it may be employed in cases of **CERTAINTY**: and the accuracy of such application depends on certain Rhetorical Principles, the nature of which, (after furnishing a few examples,) I shall leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader, since they cannot be fully treated here. Examples: **اگر صبح بدید ازین جا کوچ کرده آید** "If the morning would break, we might then march away." Here the use of the word **اگر** indicates the anxiety and impatience of the speaker for the early occurrence of a given event, (namely, the breaking of the morning,) which he well knows to be of certain occurrence. **اگر دیرین خبر من صادق باشم از تو چندی زر بگیرم** "If the information which I have now stated be true, (and I know certainly that it is true,) I shall expect so much money from you." The hearer doubts the truth of the information, and therefore the speaker employs *If*.

اگر زبده را پدر تو باشی چسدا بد ورنج رسائی "If you are the son of ZYDE, why are you the occasion of so much sorrow to him?" The person addressed is the son of ZYDE, and both parties are well aware of the fact. But he does not treat ZYDE with the respect which is due from a son to his father, and

is

is therefore, in his turn, treated by the speaker as a man who does not know that ZYDE is his father, since he does not act according to his knowledge. This principle, termed **تَنْزِيل** by Arabian writers, is of extensive operation in every Language. It would be easy to multiply the number of these examples, but the preceding will suffice for every purpose of practical use.

R U L E T H I R D.

I HAVE already stated that the relation existing between the **شرط** and the **جسرا** is properly that of the DEPENDENCE of one proposition on the other, but there are many examples in which that relation is not properly expressed in terms, and must be supplied by the means of ellipsis. The following examples are of this nature.

اگر تو امروز بر من احسان کردی من دیروز بر تو احسان نمودم "If you have favored me to day, I favored you yesterday." Supply the ellipsis: "If you think proper to boast of having favored me

to day, I desire you to remember that I can boast of having favored you yesterday." اگر تو دردی در دیت نیست در مان نیست

"If you inflict pain, it is not pain but pleasure." Supply the ellipsis: "If you inflict pain, it will be unaccompanied by the ordinary consequences of such infliction, because pain, inflicted by you, will change its nature, and be converted into pleasure."

سایبان منجمان گر خستیه سطلانی بود "If the rich are shaded by costly

canopies," ثواب کا، منجمان جسرا پر دیوار نیست "The bed-chamber of the poor is merely the shelter furnished by the walls in the street." Poverty is the boast of the Persian Poets,

and the preceding verses are certainly not intended to rouse the compassion of the reader for the state of the wretched and forlorn poor. The ellipsis must be therefore supplied as follows: "If the rich are shaded by costly canopies, it signifies nothing to me who am poor, and require no canopy of any description, other than the shelter furnished by the walls in the street," I shall not venture to multiply, further, the number

of

of examples similar to these, which the reader will be able to form for himself at pleasure.

RULE FOURTH.

THE word **اگر**, occurring in the sense of **If**, must be generally followed by two verbs in the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE, as stated in RULE FOURTH, PAGE 330, ET SEQ: of this VOLUME. Example: **اگر نمی دیدم چنین دالری نمی شدم** "Had I not seen you, I should have been less deeply in love than now I am." But, in this case, the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE is sometimes, though rarely, superceded by some of the other past tenses of the verb, in *either* member of a conditional sentence having a reference to past time. Examples:

اگر دانستم که زید افسانیت ندارد بملاقاتش نمی رفتم "If I had known ZYDE to be such a barbarian, I would not have gone to visit him;" **اگر زید دستگیرم نمی کرد مرده بودم** "If ZYDE had not assisted me, I should have died;" &c. It is not true therefore, as stated in PAGE 332 of this VOLUME, that the continuative preterite is never superceded except in the **جمله** or second member of the sentence.

RULE FIFTH.

THE word **اگر**, though commonly the first member of every sentence in which it occurs, may yet be occasionally inserted any where. Example: **اگر تو بیایی** or **تو اگر بیایی** "If you shall come, it will give me pleasure," &c. Or it may be sometimes accurately omitted in poetry, if the measure of the verse shall happen to require it. Example: **شخص تلخ خواری دامنش شیرین کن** "If you do not wish his words to be bitter, you must take the pains to sweeten his mouth;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

THE word اگر (if), compounded with ب (with) and ب (with) (اگر ب (with) ب (with) اگر) is properly translated by the word **ALTHOUGH**, which is certainly not a **CONDITIONAL PARTICLE**, since the second member of the sentence has not, in this case, any conceivable dependence on the first. Example: "تهب کنده روزی مار و مور" He prepares food for the snake and the ant, "اگر ب (with) بی دست و پا بند و زور" **THOUGH** these are without force, and without hands and feet;" &c. The word اگر is alone generally employed in prose, the other four compounds being generally or invariably restricted to poetry.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE stated that every sentence following the word اگر If, is not properly a conditional sentence; as for example: "اگر ب (with) ده می نوازنی و اگر ب (with) شی می زنی" If you favor me, or if you put me to death, "ما ب (with) ده ایم و مصائب مار ضای نیست" I am still your slave, and your approbation is the only object to which I aspire." But the reader may chuse to supply an ellipsis: "If you favor me, it will not enhance, or if you put me to death, it will not diminish, the ardor of my devotion to you;" &c. And even in this case, the sentence is not properly **CONDITIONAL**, because it might be accurately transposed as follows: "The ardor of my devotion to you is wholly independent of any condition whatever, and will subsist, equally, under the opposite extremes of favor and discouragement on your part." So, also, in the following example: "جعل خودم ب (with) فدر دار و کرم هست" A beetle will be still a beetle "اگر در میان شقایق نشست" Even if it shall take up its abode among flowers;" because the sense of the sentence

might be thus transposed: "Nothing, not even its residence among flowers, will be able to operate a change in the filthy and worthless habits of the beetle, which are so intimately interwoven with the very nature of the insect, that they cannot be eradicated by any possible means." Or, in the following example: اگر محزون بدرد و داغ عشق آنت، بیک چندی

"If MUJNOON suffered for a time the torments of love,"

ولی در ماضی هرگز چنین کاری نبغادش "Yet never did he suffer such misery as mine;" because the sense of the sentence might be thus rendered: "The pangs inflicted by LOVE, on his votary MUJNOON, however great they may have been, are beyond all comparison inferior to those which I have sustained under the lash of the same powerful and capricious DEITY."

It is affirmed, therefore, that "If you come to me, I will not give you money," the conditional character of the sentence will depend entirely on the meaning of the speaker: for if the speaker means to affirm, that "He will not give money, whether the person addressed shall come to him or not," (Even if you come, or Though you come, or Whether you come or not, I will not give you money,) then the sentence is not properly **CONDITIONAL**; and, on the contrary, if it be meant to affirm that "The coming of the party addressed will operate as a **CAUSE** to prevent the giving of money which will be otherwise paid," then the sentence is truly **CONDITIONAL** in the strict and proper sense of the term. And in my opinion, the word اگر is most properly followed by a **Conditional Sentence**, being otherwise employed, on rhetorical principles, in the sense of **ALTHOUGH**, whenever the two members of the sentence by which it is followed, are not properly **CONDITIONAL**; that is to say, whenever they are not connected by the relation of **CAUSE** and **EFFECT**.

IN

IN PAGE 333 OF THIS VOLUME, I took occasion to observe that the phrase **اِنْ كُنَّ اَزْدَنْتِبْ اَوْ مَادَرَشْ** "If the crime was indeed committed by him," **سَرَاو اِرْقَتْل بُو** "He was then worthy of the punishment of death," is not accurate; for some reason, as I there stated, connected with the sense of **اِرْ** *Ir*. I am disposed, on farther reflexion, to believe that the accuracy of the phrase in question must be admitted, because I can discover no sound principle on which it can be reasonably condemned. In the Arabic Language, the phrase **اِنْ قَتَلَ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا وَجَبَ تَمَاصُهُ** would signify "If ZYDE slew AMR, he is worthy of death;" though both verbs are here put into the past tense. And if we substitute *was* for *is* in this example, it would then, I suppose, be rendered as follows: **اِنْ قَتَلَ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا كَانَ تَمَاصُهُ حَقًّا** "If ZYDE slew AMR he *was* worthy of death;" though even in that case, I am of opinion that the phrase is by no means free of ambiguity. For in fact, it means that "If ZYDE slew AMR, his death by retaliation *will* then be just;" and this is equally true before and after the period of the infliction of punishment by the law of retaliation. Nor do I know any possible means by which the sense of past time, signified in this example by the word *was*, can be clearly and unequivocally expressed in the Arabic Language; a fact, if true, for which I conceive there must be some reason in the nature of things, though I have not been able to discover it.

It only remains to be remarked, that the preceding observations on the nature of the word **اِرْ** *Ir*, are offered to the consideration of the reader with the conscious diffidence of a man who is well aware of the difficulty of the subject, and of the consequent probability that he may have been led into error; of one who does not, indeed, believe that the word **اِرْ** is a corrupted imperative of the verb **اَرَى**, but is not therefore disposed to impeach the judgment of those who may differ in opinion

opinion from him. I now proceed to illustrate, in a few words, the nature and application of the word **اِ** Ho! Have a care!

اِ Ho! HAVE A CARE!

THIS word has been borrowed from the Arabs, and is of common occurrence in the Persian Language. It is termed, by Grammarians, **كلمه تنبيه** "An admonitory word," and seems to belong to the class of INTERJECTIONS, on the downfall of which, according to Mr. TOOKER, the dominion of Speech has been erected. Its origin has been traced by certain Etymologists to the Arabic negative **ا** NOT, and the Arabic Interrogative **اِستَنْهَام**; that particle being employed in the sense signified by the term **اِستَنْهَام اِنْكَارِي**, as explained in PAGE 114 OF THIS VOLUME. In this case, it combines the force of a double negative; namely, that signified by the word **ا**, and that obtained by means of the **اِستَنْهَام اِنْكَارِي**; and both together make an affirmative, which corroborates the sense of every sentence to which it may happen to be occasionally annexed. Be that as it may, the word **اِ** generally occurs at the beginning of a sentence, being followed by a noun in the vocative case; or, in its absence, by the tenses of a verb in the second person. Example: **اِلا اَي حَسَدٍ مَسَدٍ فَرَحْتِه تَوِي** "Have a care! you who are wise and of a good disposition;" **اِلا اَي حَسَدٍ مَسَدٍ فَرَحْتِه تَوِي** "Have a care that you nourish the tree of generosity;" **اِلا اَي كِبَرِ خَاكِو مَالْمَنْدَرِي** "Ho! you who pass over my ashes;" &c. &c.

اِ EXCEPT.

THIS Arabic word is termed in Grammar **مَوْفِ اِستثناء** or PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION; and governs the **مستثنى** or "Thing excepted:" as **اِلا بِخَوَانْدِه اِنِمْ فَرَا اَمُوشِ كَرْدِه اِنِمْ** "I have forgotten

forgotten all that ever I learned," **و نه یست یزید ار می گفتم**
 " Except the remembrance of my BELOVED, which alone
 occupies my whole soul." The **مستثنای منته** is That from which
 something is excepted; and is here comprised in the phrase
آنچه خوانده ایم, " All that I learned." As a particle of exception,
 this word is nearly or entirely synonymous with the Persian
 word **مگر**, to be considered hereafter, and to which the reader
 is therefore referred.

ب | BUT.

Mr. TOOME states that the English word BUT has a double
 sense; first, that of the ancient BOR; and secondly, that of the
 ancient BUT. According to this hypothesis, the word BOR,
 now improperly corrupted into BUT, is the imperative of an
 Anglo-Saxon verb, BOTAN, To superadd, To supply, To sub-
 stitute, &c. and these verbs may accordingly supply the place of
 BOR, (or of BUT used in the sense of BOR,) in every example
 that can be adduced. Example: " You pray, **but** (add) it is not
 that God would convert you to the true religion, **but** (add or
 substitute) that he would confirm you in your own." The
 ancient BUT, is also an imperative, derived, however, from ano-
 ther verb; namely, BEON OUTAN, To be out; into which, there-
 fore, it may be accurately resolved in every example that can
 be adduced. Example: " All but one are of the same opinion;"
 or " All, one being out, or be out one, are of the same opinion;"
 &c. In the phrase, " I saw but two plants," there is therefore an
 omission of the negative; " I saw no plants but two; or be out
 two; and this negative, commonly supplied by ancient writers, is
 often retained even in our days. Such is the simple, and pro-
 bably accurate account, which Mr. TOOME has furnished of
 the word BUT; and I anticipate, I believe, the judgment of my
 readers, in admitting its superiority over any that I am able to
 offer of the corresponding particles in the Persian Tongue.

THE Persians have borrowed from the Arabs two particles, namely, the word **أَوْ** and the word **بَلْ**, both translated by the word **BUT**. These two particles are not at all synonymous, though the Persians are found occasionally to employ **أَوْ** in the sense of **بَلْ**, an accident, I believe, which never happens in the Arabic Tongue. They are neither of them capable of expressing the idea signified by the ancient **BUT**, (Be out,) and it seems to me, that they divide between them the true meaning of the word **BUT**. By which I mean to affirm, that if we allow for some variety of application, occasioned by the diversity of idiom in either Language, according to the principle stated in **PAGE 439** of this **VOLUME**, the specific propositions, expressed in our language by **BUT** used in the sense of **BUT**, will be generally expressed, in the Persian Tongue, by one or other of the particles **أَوْ** or **بَلْ** to which I have now adverted. The meaning of the word **بَلْ** will be slightly treated in this chapter, and more fully considered in its proper place. I proceed, therefore, to make my readers acquainted with the singular opinions formed by the Arabian Grammarians on the nature and meaning of the word **أَوْ**.

THE word **أَوْ** may be accurately employed at the beginning of a discourse, like the word **AND** in our language, which seems, in this case, to refer to some ideas previously afloat in the mind of the speaker; as for example: "And whose immortal hand could shed. Upon this disk the oceans bed!" "And did he love so fond so true, Without one cheering hope in view!" "And said I that my limbs were old, And said I that my blood was cold;" &c. But the word **AND**, so used, never occurs except in poetry or impassioned eloquence; and the reason of its occurrence will be obvious, I think, to those who consider the enthusiasm of poetry, and the nature of those impetuous feelings which usually give birth to the sudden bursts of animated prose.

THE

THE occurrence of the word **أَإِ** at the beginning of a discourse, cannot be accounted for on the same principle; because it is not the property of the poet and the orator, but the ordinary drudge of mere common speech. The phrase **أَمَّا زَيْدٌ فَكَاتِبٌ** "But ZYD is a writer," is perfectly accurate in the Arabic Language, though nothing precede the word **أَإِ**, either expressed or understood in the sentence. And so, also, the phrase **أَمَّا بَعْدُ حَمْدُ اللَّهِ ذِي الْإِنْعَامِ** "But after praises to God the giver of bounty," occurs with perfect accuracy at the beginning of the **مُصْبَح**, which is not an oratorical performance, but simply a treatise on the most frigid of all imaginable subjects, namely, the syntax of Arabic Grammar. What then is the meaning of the word **أَإِ**, as it occurs in these and other similar examples?

In order to determine this point, the Arabian Grammarians have recourse to a palpable fiction; such as the European reader will never be brought to digest or admit. They suppose **أَإِ** to be formed from the word **مَهْمَا** "Whenever;" the latter being first changed into **مَامَا**, and subsequently into **أَإِ**, by disarranging the primary order of the letters. The phrase **أَمَّا زَيْدٌ فَمُتَمَلِّكٌ** "But ZYD is going," is supposed therefore according to this hypothesis, to have been originally expressed in the following form: **مَهْمَا يَكُنْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَزَيْدٌ مُتَمَلِّكٌ** "Whenever any thing happens," or according to English idiom, "Let what will happen, ZYD is going;" and thus, after digesting the not very dexterous operation by which **أَإِ** is restored to the imaginary primitive form of **مَهْمَا**, we have still to supply the words **يَكُنْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ**, before the sentence becomes intelligible.

I HAVE not the least faith in the accuracy of any part of this long process; but I believe, nevertheless, on the authority of all the Arabian Grammarians, that the phrase **أَمَّا زَيْدٌ فَمُتَمَلِّكٌ** "But

ZYD

"Zydz is going," implies a stronger assertion than the more simple phrase زَيْدٌ مُنْطَلِقٌ "Zydz is going," and consequently that the word اِمَّا, in one sense of the term, is employed to denote "the greater certainty of a given proposition," a sense which has been also ascribed by some English writers, to the word BUT. To the question, "How does it happen to denote the greater certainty of a given proposition?" I am compelled to reply that I cannot tell; since the preceding is the only account of the word اِمَّا, so employed, which has been recorded by the writers on Arabic Grammar. Those who are disposed to believe that account, will necessarily infer, with the writers in question, that the word اِمَّا is properly شَرْطِيَّةٌ or CONDITIONAL; being another form of the word اِنَّمَا, and therefore requiring the particle ف, (اِمَّا زَيْدٌ فَمُنْطَلِقٌ) which is commonly prefixed to the جُزْءِ, or second member of a conditional sentence.

BUT the word اِمَّا is also employed to indicate the relation signified by the term تَبْصِيْلٌ or DETAIL; in which case, it must follow a general proposition, which is to be detailed, or rendered specific, by two or more subsequent propositions, each following the word اِمَّا, which must, therefore, be repeated in the sentence. Example: هُمْ اَهْلُ كَمَالٍ اِنَّهُ "They are all men of eminent acquirements;" اَمَّا يَكِيٌّ عَالِمٌ اِنَّهُ "But one of them is a man of learning;" وَاَمَّا دُوْمٌ شَاعِرٌ اِنَّهُ "And another is a poet;" وَاَمَّا سَيُّوْمٌ نَثَارٌ اِنَّهُ "And the third is an eminent writer in prose;" &c.

In these two senses, the word اِمَّا is of common occurrence in the Arabic Language; but the Persians are not unfrequently found to employ that word in the sense of لَيْسَ BUT, an accident which never happens in the Arabic Tongue.

In

In this case, it denotes the relation signified by the term **اِسْتَدْرَاك** and is commonly inserted between two propositions, directly opposed to each other by sense, " for the purpose of removing, by the second proposition, a suspicion engendered on hearing the first:" this being the sense of the term **اِسْتَدْرَاك**, as explained by the writers on Arabic Grammar. Example: **زَيْدٌ اَمَّا عَمْرٍو فَبَا** for **زَيْدٌ اَمَّا عَمْرٍو فَبَا** " ZYDE came, but AMR did not come." Or, to furnish the authority of the Poet KHOSRO: **بِشَارِ تَوْبَانِ دِيدِهِ اَمَّا تَوْبِ جَرِي دِيكَرِي** " Many are the beauties that I have seen, but your beauty is of another kind;" &c. I have nothing more to observe on the nature and application of the word **اَتَا** to the purposes of speech.

اَنْدَرُوْنَ WITHIN.

THE word **اَنْدَر** seldom occurs, except in poetry, and is otherwise synonymous with the **ZURF اَنْدَرُوْنَ** WITHIN, which is derived from it, and is of common occurrence in every species of Persian composition. It is generally followed by a **ظَرْف** or " Noun significant of time or place:" as **زَيْدٌ اَنْدَرُ خَانَةِ اَسْت** or more commonly **زَيْدٌ اَنْدَرُوْنَ خَانَةِ اَسْت** " ZYDE is in the house;" but this order is sometimes, though rarely, reversed in the Language: as **اَسْت اَنْدَرُ**; **بازار اَنْدَر**; &c. and the reversed order must be adopted, if the **ظَرْف** shall be governed by the preposition **بِه** as **اَنْدَرُ** " In the Cup;" **اَنْدَرُوْنَ** " Within the house." Example: **دَرِیَارِ وَاوَا زِجْشَمِ لَبِ ثَرِ شَوْدِ دِهَرِ کَر** " Rivers flow from the fountain of my eyes, yet my parched lips imbibe no moisture;" **اِنْ مَرَقَةِ مَمَاشِ بِنِ لَبِ تَشَنَةِ بَابِ اَنْدَرِ** " Behold therefore the singular spectacle of a lip-thirsty lover immersed in the water." The word **اَنْدَرُوْنَ**, itself a **ZURF**, is necessarily followed by the mark of the **IZAFUT**, which

is not true of the word **آندَر**. The word **آندَر**, compounded with **پدر**; **مادر**; **خواهر**; **برادر**; indicates the relation signified by the term **عبرت** as **پدر آندَر** "A father in law," or "Unreal father;" **مادر آندَر** "A mother in law;" **برادر آندَر** "A half brother;" **خواهر آندَر** "A half sister;" &c.

آندِیَم PERHAPS; BECAUSE; &c.

THOUGH Persian Lexicographers consider the word **آندِیَم** to be uncompounded, there is some reason to suspect that it is in reality formed from **آند** or **آندِی**, by adding the ordinary particle **یَم**, as in the case of **باید**; **بایدِک**; or **بودِک**; often contracted into **بُوک**; &c. For the words **آند** or **آندِی** are stated in some dictionaries to have the sense of HOPE; or of SPEAKING WITH DOUBT; whence the Infinitive **آندیدن** "To speak doubtfully of any given subject." Of the occurrence of **آندِیَم** in Persian composition, the following examples will here suffice; **آندِیَم فک داندند و خطرتو** "Perhaps the heavens are apprized of your value;" **با آنکه من از عشق تو رسوائی جانم** "Though my love for you has destroyed my reputation," "I am willing to suffer, since (or because) you are the most beautiful woman in the world;" &c. From **آند** in the sense of SOME, is also derived the word **آندک** FEW OR LITTLE.

اِبر BECAUSE; THEREFORE.

I HAVE already noticed the occurrence of this word, which is another form of **اِزیر**; **اِزیر** BECAUSE; OR FOR THIS REASON.

Example: **من جوهری مُغَلَم اِبر امشوشم** "I am a poor and penniless jeweller, and therefore perplexed or uneasy," &c.

I observe the word **اَزِيرَا** is sometimes spelt **اَزِيرَا** in the **SHAH NAMA**, which is in favor of the etymology formerly proposed by me.

اَبْسَا ALSO.

This is properly an Arabic infinitive in the accusative case, governed by its own verb **اَبْسَ . يَبْسُ . اَبْسُ**. To RETURN; and the sentence, completed, would therefore run as follows: **يَبْسُ اَبْسَا** "It returns a returning;" but the verb understood, is never expressed in the common usage of the Arabic Tongue. In Arabic and Persian books, it must be generally translated by the word **ALSO**, and is nearly synonymous with the Persian **بِه**. **ALSO**, which will be duly considered in its proper place.

اَي O! or NAMELY.

As a vocative particle, the use of the word **اَي** has already been explained, in **VOLUME SECOND, PAGE 210 OF THIS WORK**. It is employed by the Arabs, and sometimes, though rarely, by the Persians also, as a **حَسْبِ تَقْسِيرٍ** or "Particle of detail;" in which case, it corresponds nearly with the word **يَبْنِي** IT MEANS; OR NAMELY; as **دِي رُو ز طَلان اَي زِيدَنَز دَمَن آمَد** "Yesterday such a person, namely **ZYDE**, came to me," **اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ اَمْرُو ز بِمَقْصُودٍ رَسِيدَم اَي بَا زِيدَنَا فَي مَشَدَم** "I thank God, I have this day accomplished my wishes; that is to say, I have met with **ZYDE**."

SECTION THIRD.

اَي WITH.

This is another, and the most common form of the word **اَي** WITH, as already stated in **PAGE 425 OF THIS VOLUME**.
The

The few observations that occur on the subject of its application to the purposes of speech, are shortly detailed in the following rules.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE word **ل** denotes the relation of ASSOCIATION, known in Grammar by the terms **مُصَابَقَت**. Examples:

زید با لبس پاکیزه است "ZYDE is well dressed;"
 خدا با ما است "BUKR is wise;" "بکر با خسر داشت
 us;" "Zyde, together with AMR, killed BUKR;" &c. I do not imagine that the word **ل** has any real fluctuations of sense, and the examples to be detailed in the following rules, will therefore be found, in all probability, to be accurately referable to the relation of ASSOCIATION, as already explained in this rule.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE word **ل**, occurring between a common substantive and the name of an event, is usually a contraction for **بِأَوَّلِهِ** or **بِأَوَّلِهِ** "In the presence of;" being generally, though not invariably, in that case, translated by the words **THOUGH** OR **NOTWITHSTANDING**. Examples:
 زید با مردن بکر دل ننگ نشد. "ZYDE is little affected by the death of BUKR, or notwithstanding the death of BUKR;"
 زید باز و ال شدن مرض آنوز تن درشت نشد. "ZYDE, notwithstanding the removal of his complaint, has not yet recovered his health;" &c. Or to furnish the authority of the Poet **SÜLMAUN**: **بَا آتَمِ رُفْتِ دَر سِرِّ مَحَبَّتِ تُو جَانِ مَن** "Though or Notwithstanding my soul has been destroyed by its love for thee," **جَانِ مَن آنوز دَر سِرِّ مَحَبَّتِ تُو وَ نای نَسْت** "Yet still is it wholly devoted to thee." In all these examples, the word **ل** might be accurately superceded by **بِأَوَّلِهِ** or **بِأَوَّلِهِ**.

RULE

Those who are appalled by
the arrow of affliction," "Why
do they presume to talk of Love!" &c.

باز AGAIN; &c.

THE application of this word is very various, and as I can offer no reasonable account of its origin or history, I shall merely furnish the reader with one or two examples of its occurrence in the Language, whether in the character of a noun or a participle. Examples: در باز کردم "I opened the door;" باز گفتم "I stripped off the skin;" باز گفتم "I again said;" از آن جا باز گشتم "I returned from thence;" باز خانه شدم "I desisted from that affair;" از آن کار باز آمدم "I returned," or simply, "I went to the house;" باز او گفتم.

Sometimes contracted into بازو گفتم, for باز و گفتم "I said to him;" &c.

بر ON, OR NEAR.

IN the sense of NEAR, the word بر is necessarily followed by the IZAFUT: as نزد من آمد or بر من آمد "He approached me;" or "He advanced near me;" and in this sense, it must be assigned, like the word نزدیک or نزدیک, to the class of the ظرف مجاز, as explained in PAGE 124, OF THIS VOLUME. Perhaps, according to Mr. TOOKE's principles, it may, in this case, be accurately referred to the substantive بر THE BOSOM; though the fact, according to my judgment, is unimportant even if it be true.

THE word بر, in the sense of ON, is very rarely followed by the IZAFUT, though some examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language: such as نشست از بر تخت پیر و زه شاه "The
" The

"The King sat down on his throne of emeralds;"
 یکی آنشی برشته نَبَاک "The region of fire was exalted
 on high;" مِسان آب و باد از برینتره خاک "And the water
 and the atmosphere were placed in the middle, just over
 the earth;" (and consequently under the region of fire;) &c.
 In this case also, the word بر, synonymous with **فوق** ABOVE,
 must be assigned to the class of the **نُزُوف** as already explained. Whether the ordinary
 omission of the **IZAFUT**, after بر in the sense of ON, does
 or does not destroy the self-significant character of that
 word, is more than I shall venture to determine; but this at
 least is certain, that the Persian Grammarians regard it as a
 NOUN whenever it is followed by the mark of the **IZAFUT**,
 and as a PARTICLE, in the absence of that mark. As a particle,
 (whether accurately or otherwise,) it is my intention to con-
 sider it here; and such observations as occur on the subject
 of its application to the purposes of Speech, are detailed, ac-
 cordingly, in the following Rules.*

RULE FIRST.

THE word **بر** ON, denotes the relation of EXALTA-
 TION, signified in Grammar by the term **رُفُو**.

* The words IN and ON, in our Language, are sometimes NOUNS of the class termed **نُزُوف**, and sometimes PARTICLES, in my opinion. They are nouns wherever they are SELF-SIGNIFICANT; as "Come in;" "Put on," (your hat;) &c. and they are particles wherever they are CONSIGNIFICANT; as "Come in two days;" "Come on Friday next;" &c. This seems to be a clear distinction, and the reader who admits it, will recognise at once the principle on which the Persian Grammarians have assigned the word **بر**, followed by the **IZAFUT**, to the class of nouns; and the same word to the class of particles, whenever the **IZAFUT** happens to be omitted. That the Persian **بر** IN, is also occasionally employed as a noun, the following example from **SAVAB**, in which that word is necessarily followed by the mark of the **IZAFUT**, will be considered as sufficient evidence: **نگاه کرد و نمودری در غشته دید**
 "He looked and beheld an ant in the grain;" for such is the reading of the best copies of the **BOOSTAUN**, though some have it **و در آن غشته**, which is less elegant in my opinion.

Examples:

Examples: **بر آئيب سوار شدم** " I mounted a horse ;"
بر سرش شلاه گران بهاست " He has, on his head, a cap of high price ;" &c. And in this sense, it may be metaphorically employed for many various purposes of Speech. **Examples:** **بر من هزار روپيه فلان است** " I owe such a man a thousand rupees ;" or " That sum of money is on my head ;"
این دلیل برای شماست بلکه بر شماست " The argument is not FOR you, but ON or AGAINST you ;"
تَقَرُّ بِأَهْلِ ثَقَرٍ اَبْرَ اَتَرِبَاسْت " It is (incumbent) ON the rich, to enquire into the state of the poor ;"
یکم روز بر بند و دل بسوخت " My heart one day felt for a slave ;" &c. It is possible, indeed, that all the examples about to be detailed in the following rules, may be accurately referred to the relation of EXALTATION, as already explained in this rule. I do not, therefore, positively affirm that the word **بر** has any real fluctuations of sense ; and leave the question to be determined by the judgment of the reader, after the examples of its application shall be fully before him.

R U L E S E C O N D.

It has been supposed to indicate the relation of Association, known in Grammar by the terms **مُصَاحَبَت** and more commonly expressed by the preposition **بِ** WITH. **Example:** **بر یوقای تو راه وفا می بستم** " With all your inconsistency, I still persist in my fidelity to you." Or the relation of CONFORMITY known in Grammar by the term **مُطَابَقَت** ; in which case, **بر** has the sense of **بر و تَقَبُّی** ACCORDING TO. **Examples:** **این جامه بر قامت زید دوخته شده** " This garment was made to fit ZYDE ;"
این کار بر مذمت فلان می گویم " I do this according to the principles of such a man ;"
سخن را بر مزاج مشتبع کنی " Speak according to the disposition of your hearer ;" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It denotes, occasionally, the relation signified by the term **TEMPORALITY**; and more commonly expressed by the preposition **بِ** IN. Examples: **بِ** رَوْتِ اَدَمَ "I came at (or in) the proper time;" **خوابِ شیرین چون کشته آورد اگر سودا بر سر است** "How should he sleep who is mad with love!" &c. Or the relation of **CAUSATION**, known in Grammar by the term **شَبَابِل**; in which case, the word **بِ** will be generally convertible with the preposition **اَز**, or the word **بِجَت**. Example: **بِ** رَغْصِيبِ نَو آرز بن حای رَدَمَ "I leave this place on account of your anger; &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It denotes, occasionally, the relation of **JUNCTION**, or **PROXIMITY**, known in Grammar by the term **اِتِّصَاق**, and often expressed by the word **بِ** or the preposition **بِ**. Example: **بِ** رَزید کُز ر کُز دَمَ or (with the **IZAFUT**) **بِ** رَزید کُز ر کُز دَمَ "I passed by ZYDE;" &c. Or the relation (signified by the preposition **بِ**) which is detailed in **RULE FIFTH, PAGE 393 OF THIS VOLUME**. Example: **اِنِ کِتَابِ بَرِ نَامِ شُما نَوِ شَمَ** "I have written this book in your name;" or "I have dedicated this book to you;" &c. Or the relation (whatever it may be) comprised in the following example, where **بِ** is convertible with the preposition **اَز**. **اَز مَن ر اِنِ شَدَ** or **بِ مَن ر اِنِ شَدَ** "He became satisfied with me."

CONCLUSION.

The preceding Examples will sufficiently illustrate the com-

mon acceptation of the word **بر** On, considered as a preposition applicable to the following substantive noun, but that word is very frequently compounded with the infinitive or tenses of a Persian verb; in which case, it may be sometimes a pleonasm: as **برآفراشت** "He raised;" **برآفروداشت** "He kindled;" &c. and sometimes significant: as **برداشت** "He took up;" **برآورد** "He brought up; or extracted;" **برکشید** "He drew forth;" and many other examples, too numerous to be inserted in any Grammatical treatise whatever. For these, and for the various senses of the word **بر** considered as a common substantive noun, or as a **ظرف** employed in the sense of NEAR, the reader is therefore referred to the Dictionary. I now proceed to offer a few observations on the nature and application of the word **بس**.

بس MUCH; MANY; OFTEN; ENOUGH; &c.

THIS word is properly significant of ABUNDANCE, being nearly synonymous with the word **بسیار** MUCH or MANY, and has no real fluctuations of sense, though variously translated according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. Examples: **بس نامور بزرگزمین دفن کرد و اند** "Many a man of celebrity has been buried in the earth;" **بس مرغ همایون که بزرگتر نظر است و ترا این قدر نامایمانی بس است** "What a very noble bird has been killed by the glance of your eye;" **بس کن ز حدیث عشق بس کن** "This (property which you possess) is sufficient for you while you remain here, or in this world;" **بس کن ز حدیث عشق بس کن** "Speak no more of love, I pray you, enough;" **ما همه فانی و بق بس تو** "We are all mortal, and to thee alone (THE DEITY) belongs eternal life;" **بق تراست و بس** "To thee belongs eternal duration, and this is enough; or there it ends;" that is to say, "Eternal duration is not the attribute

bute of any other BEING;") &c. Of the occurrence of the word **بَس**, after **از**, the following example may be adduced: **از بسکه بزند ان وقت دیر ماندیم** " So long have I lingered in the prison of my love for you;" **زنجیر تنگ آمد و زندان گدازد** " That my very chains have become weary, and my prison itself has begun to wail." The words **بَس** and **بِ** are of common occurrence in the Language, in the sense of MANY; and from the word **بَس** is derived the adjective **بَسَمَد** SUFFICIENT.

بَلِ NAY.

THIS word, borrowed from the Arabs, is of common occurrence in the Persian Language; being generally followed by the particle **که** (**بَلْ**) though that particle is sometimes omitted. It occurs properly between two propositions, both of which are fully expressed: as **یا بر من ماه است بَلْخورشید است** " My mistress is a Moon, nay, she is a Sun." It is employed to indicate the relation signified by the term **اِضْرَاب** TURNING AWAY; so called, because the speaker generally turns from the first proposition, in order to fix the attention of his hearer on the second by which it may happen to be followed.

Now the word **بَلِ** has no real fluctuations of sense, and will therefore be found to indicate the relation signified by the term **اِضْرَاب** in every example that can be adduced. But if we enquire into the possible motives of a man who turns away from one proposition in order to fix our attention on another, it will certainly appear that these are various; and the reader, I suppose, need not be told that the practical application of the word **بَلِ** to the purposes of Speech, cannot be better illustrated than by a detail of the motives, existing

ting in the mind of the speaker, which may give occasion to such application. This is the object of the following rules, which are few in number, and, as I hope, sufficiently comprehensive to effect the purpose of their insertion here.

RULE FIRST.

THE word **بَلْکِه** is occasionally found to indicate the relation signified by the term **اِثْبَات**; and this happens when the speaker intends, by the second proposition, to correct an error either committed or pointed out in the first. Examples: **زید سخی است بَلْکِه بخشن است** "ZYDE is liberal, no, not liberal, but a miser." Here the error is committed by the speaker, and immediately pointed out as a mere *LAPsus LINGUÆ*, such as may sometimes occur in oral communication, but hardly ever in written composition. **این مُژده مرا نیست بَلْکِه دشمنانم را است** "These tidings have no joy for me, but will be grateful to my enemies." The error of conception here rests, or is presumed to rest, with the party addressed; and the speaker, having pointed it out in the first proposition which is therefore negative, proceeds afterwards to correct it in the second, which is generally affirmative on that account.

RULE SECOND.

THE word **بَلْکِه** is sometimes found to indicate the relation signified by the term **تَرْقِی** ASCENSION; in which case, the second proposition will be employed to form a CLIMAX to the first. Example: **کُردانِش خوانند صاحب سبَر** "Some people call him the Lord of a throne; **و او بت بسان بَلْکِه آفاق بگر** "A conqueror of Kingdoms, nay, a prince subjecting the whole world to his dominion." Here, the first proposition is held to be defective in force of expression, and the speaker therefore

therefore turns to another, which not only confirms, but augments and extends the ideas comprised in the first.

RULE THIRD.

THE word **بَکَیَہ** is sometimes found to indicate the relation signified by the term **سَنَزَل** SINKING; which conveys an idea the very opposite of that signified by the word **تَرَقَّی**. Examples: , **دَوْرَازِ بُنَانِ مَبْدُودِیَہ بَکَیَہ**, " Never be my eyes deprived of the sight of the beloved of my soul!" **مَرَدُومِ زِدِیَہ وِیَہ زِیَہ زِیَہ زِیَہ** " Nay sooner let the BALL quit the EYE, and the EYE quit the HEAD, and the HEAD be severed from the BODY of her lover." Here, the CLIMAX of misery is obviously comprised in the first proposition, from which the devoted lover turns away, for the purpose of proposing a milder alternative; which is the meaning implied in the term **سَنَزَل** or SINKING, as opposed to the term **تَرَقَّی** ASCENSION.

RULE FOURTH.

THE word **بَکَیَہ** is sometimes found to indicate simply the relation signified by the term **اِتِّصَال** or CHANGE; in which case, it has the force merely of a COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION. Example: **زَیْدُ آدِ بَکَیَہ عَسْمَاءُ** " ZYDE came, nay AMR too came;" provided the speaker means merely to assert that " BOTH COME;" without any reference to the relations signified by the terms **اِتِّصَال**, **تَرَقَّی**, and **سَنَزَل**, as just now explained.

RULE FIFTH.

IN the Persian Language, but never I believe in the Arabic Tongue, the word **بَکَیَہ** is sometimes employed in a sense nearly approaching to that of **شَیْءٌ** PERHAPS; though even in

in that case, I am disposed to believe that its application might be traced to the relation signified by the term **اِشْرَاب**. Example: **كَلِّمْ بَطْنًا أَنْظِرْ يَمِي كُنِي اْمُرُو زِيكُنِي** "If you condescend to look on TOGHRA, let it be to day," **بَلَّيْهَ اَزْوَ دُوْزِ اِقِي تُوْبَقُوْ دَا تَرَسَد** "For, overwhelmed by the pain of his absence from you, it is probable that he will not be alive to-morrow!" &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE Arabian Grammarians have observed that the word **بَلَّيْهَ** is sometimes followed by a **مَقْرُو**; the term **مَقْرُو** being opposed to the term **بَلَّيْهَ**. A SENTENCE, in the manner stated in a note to PAGE 57 OF THIS VOLUME. In this case, the sentence may be AFFIRMATIVE: as **زَيْدٌ اَمَدَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَر** "ZYDE came, nay AMR;" or IMPERATIVE: as **زَيْدُ رَا بَزَنَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَرَا** "Beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" or NEGATIVE: as **زَيْدٌ نَبَا بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَر** "ZYDE did not come, nay AMR;" or PROHIBITIVE: as **زَيْدُ رَا بَزَنَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَرَا** "Do not beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" &c. And in the case of an affirmative or imperative sentence, the Arabian Grammarians have determined unanimously that "ZYDE is to be considered as **سَكُوْتُ عَسْمَر**," that is to say, "as if his name had not been mentioned in the sentence at all." The phrase **زَيْدٌ اَمَدَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَر** means therefore that "AMR came;" but whether ZYDE came or not, is a point on which we have no information. And so, also, the phrase **زَيْدُ رَا بَزَنَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَرَا** means merely "Beat AMR;" but whether ZYDE is to be beaten or not, is a point on which we have no information.

BUT if we substitute the negative: **زَيْدٌ نَبَا بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَر** "ZYDE did not come, nay AMR;" or the prohibitive: **زَيْدُ رَا بَزَنَ بَلَّيْهَ عَسْمَرَا** "Do not beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" the question

question is not equally clear according to the opinion of the Arabian Grammarians, who differ materially from each other in the decisions which they have adopted on the subject of it. The majority maintain that ZYDE is not here to be considered as **سَكَتَ عَنْهُ**, in which case, the proposition is effective with regard to him, (ZYDE,) of whom it is affirmed that "He did not come," and that "We are not at liberty to beat him." Others maintain that ZYDE is here also **سَكَتَ عَنْهُ**; in which case, the proposition is non effective with regard to him; that is to say, we cannot tell whether he came or not, nor have we any orders either to beat him, or let him alone. And the same obscurity here envelopes the fate of AMR, since the Arabian Grammarians have left it doubtful whether the negative comprised in the first member of the sentence (**زَيْدٌ رَأَى** or **زَيْدٌ نَبَأَ**) is to be affirmed or destroyed in the second, though the latter is held to be the better opinion. If the negative be affirmed (or continued) in the second member of the sentence, the meaning of the words **بَيَّنَّ عَنْهُ** will then be **بَيَّنَّ عَنْهُ** "Nay AMR did not come;" and, on the contrary, if the negative shall be destroyed, we must then supply **بَيَّنَّ عَنْهُ**. "But AMR came."

It follows from these observations, that the phrase **زَيْدٌ نَبَأَ بَيَّنَّ عَنْهُ** is essentially obscure in all its parts; because it may signify, *first*, that ZYDE did not come; *secondly*, that we have no information with regard to the coming or not coming of ZYDE; *thirdly*, that AMR came; and *finally*, that AMR did not come. And this obscurity, which warrants the condemnation of all such phrases, may, I conceive, be easily traced to the nature of the relation signified by the term **اضراب**, which the word **بَيَّنَّ** is formed to denote.

With regard to the phrase **زَيْدٌ نَبَأَ بَيَّنَّ عَنْهُ** "ZYDE came,

came, no, but AMR," it will generally mean that "ZYDE did not come, but AMR came;" and so, also, the phrase زید نیامد نه بکله عمر "ZYDE did not come, no, but AMR," seems to me to have the same sense: "ZYDE did not come, no, but AMR came;" because the second negative is here employed, not to destroy, but merely to corroborate the sense of the first. It is obvious, however, that these phrases are essentially obscure, and therefore unfit for general use. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of the word بلی Yes, to the purposes of speech.

بلی Yes.

THIS word, borrowed from the Arabs, and by them written and pronounced بلی, is of common occurrence in the Persian Language; being employed in the sense of آری Yes, with which it is synonymous in every respect. The reader will therefore revert to PAGE 428 ET SEQ. OF THIS VOLUME, and substituting, in every example, the word بلی for the word آری, will thence infer the proper application of either to every purpose of Persian composition.

IN the Arabic Language, the practical application of the word بلی Yes, is much more limited than it is found to be in the Persian tongue: for it cannot be uttered as an answer to any affirmative proposition whatever; being directly opposed, in point of sense, to the word لا No, which is the answer, in the negative, to a proposition expressed in the affirmative form. And as the word لا destroys the affirmative, so the word بلی destroys the negative; both being opposed, in point of sense, to the word نعم Yes or No, which is employed indifferently to affirm the positive or negative form of every proposition to which it may happen to be uttered as an answer.

To

To explain by examples. The phrase "ZYDE came," or "Did ZYDE come?" cannot be answered by the word بَلَى, because it is expressed in the affirmative form. But it may be answered by the words نَعَمْ Yes or لا No, by the former of which, the hearer is given to understand that "ZYDE came;" and by the latter, that "ZYDE did not come." And the phrase "ZYDE did not come," or "Did not ZYDE come?" cannot be answered by the word لا No, because that word never answers any proposition which is not expressed in the positive form. But it may be accurately answered by the word نَعَمْ "No; ZYDE did not come;" or by the word بَلَى "Yes; ZYDE came;" whence it is obvious, *first*, that بَلَى is properly employed to convert the negative into the positive form; *secondly*, that لا is properly employed to convert the positive into the negative form; and *finally*, that نَعَمْ is properly employed to establish the form, whether positive or negative, in which a given proposition may have been first uttered. It follows that the phrase اَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ "Am not I your God?" supposed to have been addressed by the DEITY to his creatures, was properly answered by the word بَلَى Yes; and that نَعَمْ, employed instead of بَلَى, would have been there equivalent to a denial of the truth. *

نَعَمْ NEVER; Also.

I HAVE nothing to observe of this word, except that it occurs occasionally in either of the senses here im-

* Sir WILLIAM JONES has mistaken the sense of the phrase mentioned in the text, which he somewhere translates, "Are not you with your God?" misled by the introduction of the preposition *وَبِهِ* which is here a mere pleonasm. That he mistook لَسْتُ in the first person for لَسْتُ in the second, was perhaps a natural consequence of the first error.

puted to it. Examples: "دَر مَح ناکسَن نَمَسَم کُتْمَن بَرَسِنْد" "I shall never disgrace myself by the praise of the unworthy;" "نَه اِن رَا بَسَا زُو رُو قَر مِ بَرَسِنْد" "Neither, also, did the one ever occasion vexation to the other;" &c.

بی WITHOUT.

THIS is another, and the most common form of the word **بی**, already noticed in PAGE 426 OF THIS VOLUME. It indicates the relation of PRIVATION, known in Grammar by the term **سَب**; and is indifferently applicable to nouns of every species: as **زید بی بکر آمد** "ZYDE came without BUKR;" **زید بی صبر است** "ZYDE has no patience;" **بی و تبران عشرتی نباید خواست** "Seek no pleasure without your beloved;" &c. Like most of the prepositions, it may form a component part of a compound epithet: as **مرد بی زر** "A moneyless man;" **خانه بی در** "A house without a door;" **مرد بی صبر** "An impatient man;" **جام بی باوه** "A cup without wine;" **تخت بی تاجور** "A throne without a king;" **محببت بی یار** "Society in the absence of a beloved object;" **عاشق بی وندار** "A lover who is deprived of the presence of his beloved;" &c. And in this case, it is necessary that the second component part of the epithet shall not be capable of forming an attributive applicable to the substantive noun expressed in the sentence, without the intervention of some preposition. Accordingly, the attributive **تاجور** "A prince," cannot be applied to the substantive **تخت** "A throne," without the intervention of some preposition; nor can the adjective **وندار** "A beloved object," without the intervention of some preposition, be here applied to **عاشق** "The lover;" because the phrase **وندار** means **عاشق** "The

"The

"The keeper of the heart of the lover," an epithet which obviously belongs to his mistress, and cannot be accurately assumed by him. In the absence of this condition, the negative **لَا** will necessarily supercede the preposition **بِ** as **مَرْوَانَ عَسَافِلَ** "A foolish man;" **مَرْوَانَ خَسِرَ وَمَتَ** "An unwise man;" &c. And the difference of sense between **لَا** and **بِ** will be obvious to those who consider that the former implies mere NEGATION, whereas the latter implies PRIVATION.

بِ AFTER; THEN; &c.

THIS word is unquestionably a noun of the class termed **مُرُوف**; being opposed, in point of sense, to the word **بِ** BEFORE, which has never been assigned to the class of particles by any Grammarian. Yet the word **بِ** being very commonly employed to translate the Arabic particle **ف**, has been therefore supposed to perform the functions of a PARTICLE, as well as of a NOUN; and though I will not undertake to affirm the accuracy of this opinion, or to maintain that the word **بِ** has in reality the character of a particle on any occasion, I think myself bound nevertheless, to detail, in the form of general rules, the facts that relate to its practical use, in order that the reader may judge for himself.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE word **بِ** is occasionally employed to denote the relation of ARRANGEMENT, known in Grammar by the term **تَرْتِيب**. Examples: **زَيْدٌ أَمَّ بِيَسْتَمِر** "ZYDE came first, and then BUKR;" **زَيْدٌ أَمَّ بِيَسْتَمِر دَوْنَت** "ZYDE came, and then BUKR went away;" &c. In this case, the word **بِ** indicates merely the order of arrangement, and the accident of DELAY is commonly signified by the word **بِ** some TIME AFTER.

R U L E

RULE SECOND.

THERE is a species of ARRANGEMENT known in Grammar by the term ترتیب ذکرى, which is often signified by the word بس. In this case, the word بس occurs after a general proposition, which is to be detailed or rendered specific by two or more following propositions. Example:

“When the morning broke, I prepared for prayer;” بس وضو کردم و در مسجد رفتم. “Accordingly, I performed my ablutions and went to the mosque;” “And put in practice (the prescribed ceremonies, namely,) standing, sitting, bending the body, and prostration;” &c. و به رُقبم و نشستم و در رکوع و سجود پرداختم

RULE THIRD.

THE word بس is often employed to denote the relation of SEQUENCE, known in Grammar by the term تَعْقِيب; and in this case, it is a matter of no importance whether the SEQUENCE shall be remote or immediate, necessary or contingent; &c. Examples: “I struck the ball with a club, and it moved;” گوی را با چوبکان زدم بس متحرک شد

“ZYDE married, and had a child by his wife” &c. زید نکاح کرد بس او را فرزندى بوجود آمد

RULE FOURTH.

It is employed to denote the relation signified by the term تَفْرِیع; in which case, it will govern a given proposition comprising the deduction which is drawn from certain preliminary observations or facts. Example from MOLOVKE ROOM: “I ceased to be از جمیع مردم دنیاى منم

be

be (insensible as a clod or) a stone; and attained the rank of vegetative life;" **و زعمما مردم از خسیران دم زددم** "I again changed my state, and became an animal;" **بسم** "Ceasing to be an animal, I then became a man;" **بسم** **پس از آنکه من از مردمان کم شدم**

"What then have I to fear? and when has death been the cause of degradation to me?" Or more literally, "I died as a stone, and became a vegetable; I died as a vegetable, and became an animal;" &c. The Molovee alludes, in all probability, to the circumstances that precede and follow the organization of life. The elementary materials of the future man, at first insensible like a clod or a stone, become vegetative at the period of conception: gestation follows, and ripens these into an animal endued with sensation and life. Thought and reason bring up the rear, and mark the maturity of intellectual growth. Whence it follows, that every change having hitherto proved advantageous to him, he has no cause to fear DEATH, which is not the precursor of annihilation, or even the signal of descending gradation, but merely a change of STATE OR BEING, precisely similar to those sustained on so many former occasions, and therefore a blessing, because it marks his entrance into a HIGHER state of intellectual existence. He goes on, accordingly, to predict his advancement to the rank of an Angel, and subsequent progress in the scale of BEING, up to the very DEITY himself, from whose ESSENCE his spirit originally emanated, and with whom it is ultimately destined to unite, in a union so inconceivably perfect as utterly to annihilate the idea of distinction between the CREATURE and the CREATOR; in which consists the SUMMUM BONUM of these visionary, but sublime devotees.

بار دیگر که میبندم از بشر "If I am doomed as a man to die once more;" **بار دیگر که میبندم از بشر** "Even so shall I rise to the

the rank of an Angel;" **وَزَمَكْتُمْ بِأَيْدِيكُمْ قَرَبَانِ شَدَن** "And thence will approach still nearer to God,"

أَنْجُو أَنْدَرُوتُمْ مَابِدَ أَنْ شَدَن "And become at length what I cannot describe!"

R U L E F I F T H.

THE word **بِسْ** may be accurately prefixed to the second member of a conditional sentence proper and improper; or to the second member of a sentence formed by means of a relative pronoun. Examples: **اگر کار کنی بس مزد باری** "If you work, you shall obtain the reward of your labor;" **زید که پدر رست بس از عقوبتش بترس** "ZYDE being your father, you should therefore beware of disobeying him;" &c. Or the relation signified by the term **سببیت**, in which case, it comes between two propositions connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT. Example: **زید را اندرز دادم بس مانجوش شد** "I admonished ZYDE, and therefore he became angry;" &c.

C O N C L U S I O N.

I HAVE nothing farther to observe on the nature of the word **بِسْ**, which seems to me to have the same sense in every example that can be adduced. In translations from the Arabic into the Persian Tongue, the word **بِسْ** is often inserted with some violation to the idiom of the latter, merely because that of the former requires the use of the particle **بِ**, which cannot be translated by any other word. It is the duty of every translator to represent faithfully the sense of his author; but the servile habit of introducing into one Language words required merely by the idiom of another, and no way necessary to the sense of a passage, must be considered as highly reprehensible, since it tends only to the debasement of Speech.

ل To; SINCE; UNTIL; &c.

The word ل is directly opposed, in point of sense, to the word از FROM; and therefore indicates the END OF A SPACE, (اَنِتَبَی نَایِت) being indifferently applicable to TIME; PLACE; NUMBER; and QUANTITY; as the following examples will sufficiently evince. "I walked from morning to even;" "I travelled from Hind even to Sind;" "The number gradually increased from one to a thousand men;" "I looked at him attentively from head to foot;" &c. The idea of space or distance, may be also applied by metaphor to certain events considered with reference to each other: as for Example: "There is a great difference between hearing and seeing;" (between hear-say and sight;) "And it is one thing to talk, and another thing to act;" &c. I proceed to detail the rules applicable to the practical application of the word ل to the purposes of Speech: having first premised that though I believe that word has no real fluctuations of sense, I will not undertake to affirm the fact, but leave the question to be determined by the judgment of the reader, after the examples to be considered shall be fully before him.

RULE FIRST.

If the word ل shall occur between two nouns of the same class, (that is to say, if the sense of the second shall be included in that of the first, as the LIMBS are included in the general sense of the term BODY,) then the sense of the verb which is transitive to the first noun, will be generally transitive to the second

second also. Example: **بای رانا سہ شش خوردم** "I eat the fish even to the head; or including the head;" **همہ کس نازید ما خبر آمدند** "All these people came, even to, **ZYDE**; or including **ZYDE**;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D,

If the two nouns shall not be of the same class, the sense of the verb applicable to the first noun, will not be generally transitive to the second. Example: **تمام روز تا شب رفتم** "I walked all day until night;" (at which time, I ceased to walk;) &c. It is probable that there are some exceptions to each of these rules.

R U L E T H I R D.

THE noun following the particle **ل** is generally the last of those to which the action of the verb is transitive: as for Example: **قرآن رانا سورہ ناس خواندم** "I read the KOORAN, (or its chapters,) even to, or including the SOORA 4 NAUS," which is the last Chapter in the Book. But if the nouns to which the verb is transitive shall differ in their nature from each other, the last noun will then be determined by adverting merely to the probabilities of the case. Example: **همہ انسان تا پینچ مہر ان مالک آند** "All men die, even to the prophets;" **همہ فوج تا سپاہ رسیدند** "The whole army arrived, even to, or including the foot soldiers;" &c. DEATH is less likely to happen to the prophets than to other men; and the arrival of soldiers travelling on foot is likely to follow the arrival of those who travel by any quicker conveyance; whence it happens that both here follow the word **ل**, because the arrangement is determined, not by a reference to the order of time, (since the foot may have arrived before the horse,) but simply by adverting to the probabilities of the case,

R U L E

RULE FOURTH.

THE word **وَ** is found occasionally to denote the relation of ASSOCIATION; known in Grammar by the term **مَجْتَمِعٌ**, and commonly expressed by the word **وَ**, or the copulative conjunction **وَإِوَاطِفٌ**. Example: **مَرْدَانٌ نَاكُودَ كَانِ بَعْمَ آئَمَدُ** . "The men and the children assembled together." But the example might be thus translated: "The men, even to the children, assembled together;" whence it follows that the word **وَ** does not here suffer any real fluctuation of sense.

RULE FIFTH.

THE word **وَ** is found occasionally to denote the relation of EXPLANATION, known in Grammar by the term **تَنْبِيْهِ**. Example: **زَيْدُ رَاكَتُمْ نَا اُسْرَ اَمُوْرُوْ**; "I told ZYDE that he should acquire excellence;" &c. Or the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term **تَغْلِيْبٌ**: in which case, it indicates the END OR PURPOSE (**فَاَيْتٌ وَغَرَضٌ**) for which a given action is to be, or may have been performed. Example: **دَرْخْتِ اِثَانَدَمْ نَا بَرْخُوْرَمْ** "I have planted trees that I may eat the fruit;" &c. But in the event of the narration, by the speaker, of a COMMAND which has been obeyed, the verb following the particle **وَ** will generally assume the form of the past tense. Example: **قَرَا اِشِسْ بَا وَصَبَا رَا اَكْتَفَتَه نَا فَرْشِسْ زُ مَرْوِيْنِ بَكْتَشَرْدُ** "He (the DEITY) issued his commands to the morning breeze, which spread, accordingly, the verdant carpet of the earth;" &c. The substitution of the aorist, **گُشَرْدُ** would no doubt be accurate here: "He issued his commands to the morning breeze to spread, or (more literally) that it should spread the verdant carpet of the earth;" but then it would remain doubtful (if, for the DEITY, we substitute the name of an earthly ruler,) whether the command was obeyed or

not. This doubt is very briefly removed by substituting for the aorist the past tense of the verb, which is therefore elegant in all the examples of this class.

R U L E S I X T H.

It indicates occasionally the BEGINNING OF A SPACE OF TIME; or more properly, in my opinion, the WHOLE space of time comprised in the proposition by which it is followed. Examples: "ناگزده ام بکلام لیس آب تو نکلا." Ever since I have seen your lips full of moisture; "ناگزده ام بزم کس بر خواب تو نظر." Ever since I have looked on your languishing eyes; "کای چو لاله ام ز وصال شکفته رو." Sometimes I blossom in your presence like a tulip; "کای چو نرگس ز فراقش شکفته سر." And sometimes I droop in your absence like the NURGIS." If the two propositions by which the particle **ا** is followed in all the examples of this class, shall happen to be connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT, the word **ا** is then termed **نای شرطیه** OR THE CONDITIONAL **ا**, because its place may be supplied by the word **چون**: or otherwise it is commonly termed **نای ابتدایه**, or "The **ا** which indicates the beginning of a space of time." Examples: "نازید را دیده ام هر کس از وی نه شنیده ام." Ever since I have seen (or known) ZYDE, I have seen nothing in his conduct which I can approve." (This is the **نای ابتدایه**) "نازید را دیده ام هر کس از وی نه شنیده ام." Ever since your idea has been the inmate of my bosom, I have shut my eyes against all mankind." (This is the **نای شرطیه**, but there is not, in my opinion, any essential distinction between them.)

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It is found to indicate occasionally the relation signified by the term **توقیت**, an infinitive derived from **وقت** TIME. In

In this case, it corresponds with the English word **WHILE**; being employed to limit the duration of one proposition, by the means of another with which it is connected. Example:

“ *که تا بر ملک ماه و خورشید است* ” For while the **SUN** and the **MOON** keep their places in the heavens;”

“ *درین دفترت ذکر جاوید است* ” Your name shall be preserved in this volume.” It is obvious that one of these

propositions is here employed “to measure the period of the duration of the other;” and as the one is eternal, so the other is declared to be so too. And if we substitute the

phrase “ *تو بنشین تا زید بنشیند* ” “Do you sit, **WHILE** **ZYDE** sits,”

both propositions will then be temporary; but still the duration of one will serve as a limit to that of the other. This

(and every similar) example admits however of another sense: “Do you sit **UNTIL** **ZYDE** sits; or shall sit;” (“and when he sits do you get up;”) and the context alone

can determine which of these two senses may happen to be intended on a given occasion. If we substitute for “ *تو بنشین تا زید بنشیند* ”

the compounded form “ *تو بنشین تا زید بنشیند ماند* ” (*در نشسته ماند*)

“Do you sit while **ZYDE** continues to sit;”) the obscurity will necessarily cease, and the word **تا** must then be trans-

lated by the word **WHILE**. The two propositions are distinguished from each other by the terms *موقت* or “Limited in duration;” and *موقوف* “Limitary;” or “That

by which the other is limited.”

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE word **تا** is often employed, before an Interrogative, to indicate the relation of **DOUBTFUL EXPECTATION**; known in Grammar by the terms *ترقب و انتظار*. In this case, it is supposed to be nearly equivalent to the words *با بدوید* “Let us see;” or “Let it be seen;” though it might be accurately translated,

translated, in my opinion, by the word THEN. Example:
 " Let us see then which of these two events fortune is disposed to accomplish in my case," *نابرجه خواهد گردید یا من و وزیر گیتی از دو کار*
 " Shall her arms encircle my neck, or shall my blood be on her head!" *دست او دوز گردنم یا خون من در گردنش*
 &c.

R U L E N I N T H.

It has been supposed to indicate occasionally the sense of the word *هرگز* NEVER: as for Example:
 " Never imagine that the condition of worldly men is happy." Or to convey some idea of REPROACH and CENSURE; as for Example:
 " O ! you who ostentatiously expose your virtues in the palms of your hands," *ای ای شتر نازده برکت و دست*
 " And hide your vices under your arms," *عیب های گرفت ز زیر بغل*
 " For shame ! what do you expect to purchase, O proud man!" *نابرجه خواهی خریدن ای متعور*
 " On the day of judgment, with money that is base!" *روز درمندی بشیم و فل*
 that is to say, " What will it then avail you to boast of the appearance of virtues, which, in reality, you do not possess." In either of these examples, the particle *تا* might be accurately translated, in my opinion, by the word THEN.

R U L E T E N T H.

THE particle *که* may be optionally inserted after *تا* employed to denote the relations signified by the terms *تعلیل* ; *و توثیق* ; and *شرط* ; as already explained in the preceding rules. Examples : *نیکی کن تا که بدی گردت نیاید*
 " Practise virtue, that so no evil may befall you;"
تا که زید را دیده ام از وی خورسند بوده ام
 " I have been pleased

ed with ZYDE, ever since I saw him;” تا که یار را دیدم “ Ever since I have seen my BELOVED;” ز دوی غم دیدم “ I have never seen the face of grief;” تک نام باش “ Continue to preserve a good name;” تا که جهان بایدار باشد “ While the world endures.” But the word ک is not unfrequently found to take precedence of ن. Example:

از بدی گریزان باش که تا تک نام شوی “ Avoid evil, that so you may obtain a good name;” &c.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE little more to observe on the nature and application of the word ت, which is very commonly added to numerals, for the purpose of forming a species of the relative noun: as **ت** UNIQUE; **و** DOUBLE; **سه** TRIPLE; &c. &c. Here, however, it is perhaps a noun, having the sense of **فرد** SINGLE, as opposed to **بیت** A MATCH. It is otherwise employed in various senses for which the reader is referred to the Dictionary.

تاش

THIS is a termination, employed to indicate “ the participation of two or more objects in the sense of the noun to which it is annexed:” as **خو بر تاش** “ A fellow servant;” or literally, “ Either of two or more individuals who participate in the service of the same master;” **قبیل تاش** “ Either of two or more members of the same tribe;” &c. Example:
من و تو هر دو خوا بر تاش ایم “ You and I are fellow servants of the same master;” &c.

بجز OTHER; EXCEPT; &c.

THIS word properly signifies OTHER, and has no real fluctuations of sense. It is nearly synonymous with the Arabic **غیر**.
 6 E but

but cannot, like that word, be employed in the sense of a negative, before a given adjective noun: as *زبدختر عاقل است* "ZYDE is unwise;" &c. It is necessarily followed by the *مضاف الیه*, but without the intervention of the vowel *Ausra*: as *بر خدا هیچ است* "All but God is nothing;" &c. Yet the place of that vowel point is sometimes supplied by the preposition *از*: as *چند از توندانم درین عهد کس* "I know no man (that is to say, no good or generous man,) in this age, but only you;" &c. Being a noun, not a particle, it may, like other nouns, form the subject or the predicate of a given proposition; the agent or object of a given verb; &c. as *که بشنید او ندانمش ز زبان* "He never spoke of any thing but her;" or more literally, "Other than the remembrance of her never passed his lips."

Or its occurrence in the sense of *مگر*, the following example may be adduced: *داری بحال ز ابر غریبان ترنجی* "You have compassion on the state of all the wretched;" *چند از صفی که بهر تو شد از وطن جدا* "Except AUSTFEE, who has been separated from his home on your account." It is to be observed, however, that the word *مگر* never precedes the *مستثنی منه*; a fact which is not true of the word *چند*, which may precede the *مستثنی منه*: as *چند زید همه رسیدند* "They are all arrived but ZYDE;" &c. The particle *به*, prefixed as a mere pleonasm to the word *چند*, is of common occurrence in the Language: as *چند تو نیست دلداری* "I have no mistress but only you;" &c.

SECTION FOURTH.

چون How? WHEN; SINCE; AS; LIKE; &c.

As an INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN, in the sense of HOW? the word *چون* has already been considered in PAGE 118 OF THIS

VOLUME,

VOLUME, to which the reader is therefore referred. As a **ظَرْفِ زَمَان** or **NOUN OF TIME**, it must be generally translated by the word **WHEN**: and as a **كَلِمَةُ تَشْبِيهِ** or **WORD OF SIMILITUDE**, it has generally the sense of the word **LIKE**. These are two distinct characters of the word **وَظَن**, each of which are now to be considered in their order.

وَظَن WHEN.

THIS word cannot be accurately employed as an interrogative pronoun; ("When did you see this man?" &c.) and must therefore be invariably followed by **TWO PROPOSITIONS**, as in the phrase **وَظَن زَيْدٌ أَهْبَكَرَ رَمْتَ** "When ZYDE arrived, BUKR departed," and other examples of the same nature. It indicates "the coincidence, in point of time, of the occurrence of two given events comprised in either member of the sentence by which it is followed:" whence it follows, with reference to the preceding example, that "The arrival of ZYDE, and the departure of BUKR, happened nearly at the same period of time." And as we have here no information with regard to the **CAUSE** of the departure of BUKR, which may or may not be owing to the arrival of ZYDE, so it follows that the two members of a sentence following the word **وَظَن** WHEN, are not necessarily connected by the relation of **CAUSE AND EFFECT**. But though not necessarily, they are very commonly connected by that relation: as it happens in the phrase **وَظَن بَارَمٌ بِرَسَدِ كَارَمِ آسان گَزَدَ** "When my BE-LOVED arrives, I shall then be easy;" for though the word **وَظَن** indicates merely the coincidence, in point of time, of the occurrence of the two events comprised in either member of this proposition, it is quite plain that the speaker is enabled to predict that coincidence, merely by the conviction, existing in his mind, that the events in question are connected by the relation of **CAUSE AND EFFECT**. The sentence, there-
fore,

fore, is obviously conditional: " When my BELOVED arrives, I shall then be easy, because her arrival will necessarily produce the effect of making me easy ;" and the word **وَإِذَا**, by which it is governed, is accordingly termed **شَرْطِيَّة** or **CONDITIONAL**; not because that word has *itself* acquired a **CONDITIONAL** character, but merely because it governs the two members of a sentence connected by the relation of **CAUSE AND EFFECT**. I now proceed to detail the rules applicable to the practical application of the word **وَإِذَا** **WHEN**, followed by the two members of a conditional sentence: having first premised that there is nothing to be observed on the practical application of that word, followed by the two members of a sentence which is not conditional; that is to say, connected by the relation of **CAUSE AND EFFECT**.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE past tenses of the verb *must* be employed, as it might be expected, to indicate past time in both members, or in either member of a **CONDITIONAL SENTENCE** following the word **وَإِذَا** **WHEN**. Examples: **وَالْآنَ بِسِرِّهِ تَذَكَّرُ أَنْ تَكُنْ** " O my heart, now that you are old, leave off, I pray you, the follies of youth;" **وَإِذَا جَاءَ سَيِّدِي بِأَزِيدٍ وَوَجَّاهُ مُدْمِ** " When I arrived there, I met with **ZYDE** ;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE Aorist, or the Future tense of the verb *may* be accurately employed, as it might be expected, to indicate future time in both members, or in either member of a **CONDITIONAL SENTENCE** following the word **وَإِذَا** **WHEN**. Example: **بِشِدِّهِ يَتَوَّابِعُ كُلَّ رُؤْيَى نَوْبِكِ نَظَرًا** " When the gardener shall once behold the rose of your face," **وَيَكْبُرُ بَعْدَهُ نَوْبُ دَنْدِرَةِ آبِ لَالِ رَا** " He will never more take the pains to water the tulip." (So inferior is the color of that flower, to the blooming lustre of your fine complexion.)

RULE

R U L E T H I R D.

BUT the PAST tense of the verb may be also employed, and is in fact more frequently employed than the Aorist or Future tense, to indicate FUTURE TIME in both members, or in either member of a CONDITIONAL SENTENCE following the word **چون**.

WHEN. Example: **شراب خورد، و خوی کرد، چون شدی بچسن**
 " When you WALK into the garden, your face bedewed, and flushed with wine;" **زویخ روی تو آتش در آرزوان انداخت**

" The lustre of your complexion ADDS, OR WILL ADD, new vermillion even to the tints of the Arghawaun." It follows plainly, from the employment of the past tense of the verb to denote, indifferently, past or future time, that the preceding example might be otherwise translated: " When you WENT into the garden, your face bedewed, and flushed with wine, the lustre of your complexion ADDED new vermillion even to the tints of the Arghawaun." How then is the obscurity to be removed, which is obviously inherent in all the examples of this nature? I answer that it cannot be removed otherwise than by adverting to the context, which will certainly determine the question in every necessary case. And if the question cannot be determined by the context, as it very often happens in Persian poetry, the reader will then be at liberty to give the preference to past or future time, according to the dictates of his own fancy or judgment.

C O N C L U S I O N.

I HAVE little more to observe on the nature and application of the word **چون** WHEN; which may be accurately followed by all the tenses of a Persian verb, being variously translated by the words WHEN; WHENEVER; SINCE; or AS; &c. according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. When followed by the Aorist or Future tense, it is very often convertible with **اگر** If: as in the phrase

بِسَبَبِ رُؤْيِ رُؤْيِ مُوَبَكِّ نَظَرِ " When the gardener shall once behold the rose of your face," where اِكْرٌ might supply the place of رُؤْيِ, without producing any very material change in the sense of the passage. But if we examine attentively the proper acceptation of either term, it will certainly appear that the word اِكْرٌ If, is usually employed in cases of DOUBT; whereas the word رُؤْيِ WHEN, is commonly employed in cases of CERTAINTY. We say "If the two armies shall come to a battle," when that event is matter of doubt; and generally convert the If into WHEN; "When the two armies shall come to a battle," in the case of an expectation, previously formed, that a battle between them is about to take place. And as the Persians are very commonly in the habit of expressing, by the past tense of the verb, those future events which they believe to be of certain occurrence; so, a given proposition having a real reference to future time, will yet be very commonly expressed by the past tense of the verb, whenever it happens to follow the word رُؤْيِ WHEN, which is naturally applicable to cases of CERTAINTY. It remains only to remark that the word رُؤْيِ WHEN, is sometimes understood where it is not expressed: as

سَالِحِ جَرَكْتِه بَرَمَن زَاوَتِ نَظَرِي بَهْت " Since you have no disposition to favor me, what can FORTUNE effect in my favor? &c. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of the word رُؤْيِ LIKE; which is a كَلِمَةُ تَشْبِيْهِ or WORD OF SIMILITUDE.

رُؤْيِ LIKE.

THE terms of a SIMILE fully expressed, comprise, *first*, the مَشَبِّه or "Thing compared;" *secondly*, the مَشَبِّهٌ بِهِ or "Object with which it is compared;" *thirdly*, the اَدَاتُ التَّشْبِيْهِ or "Instrument of comparison;" as رُؤْيِ or مَانَشِدٌ LIKE; and *finally*, the وَجْهُ التَّشْبِيْهِ or "Point of comparison;" as

COURAGE;

COURAGE; &c. which must be common to both nouns, and more especially remarkable in the **مُشَبَّه**. Example: زَبَدِ در شجاعت چون شیر است "ZYDE, in point of courage, resembles a Lion;" &c. The **وَجْهَ التَّشْبِيهِ** or POINT OF COMPARISON, is not, however, invariably expressed in terms; and will be commonly and elegantly omitted in the case of simile of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission. Example: دُو دِبا كِزَه پستِ جو جو زو و بری "Two fine youths, GRACEFUL as the Howras of paradise; with FORMS delicate as that of the Fairies;" جو جو زرشید و چون زهره و دشتی "In SPLENDOR equal to the SUN; having VOICES soft and tuneful as that of VENUS; and of an UNDERSTANDING which rivals the wisdom of JUPITER;" &c. The **اَوَاتُ التَّشْبِيهِ** or INSTRUMENT OF COMPARISON, as مانند; &c. is often omitted on the same principle.

EXAMPLE FROM FERDOUSEE.

یہ قوہ زندہ پسئل و بجان جبرئیل
ہیک آبر بہن بدل رُو و نیست

"His body strong as a raging elephant; his mind pure as the Angel GABRIEL; his hand bountiful as the raining clouds; his heart liberal as the flowing NILE."

AND the Persian Poets, proceeding yet a step farther, are very fond of rejecting every part of the simile, except only the **مُشَبَّه**, which then supplies the place of the **مُشَبَّہ**, creating a source of endless difficulty to the European readers of Persian Poetry, who are not easily brought to comprehend the multiplicity of remote or unknown metaphors often crammed into the compass of a single line. Example: طرف سمن جو بر شست سنبل حلقہ زای را "When she hung the circling hyacinth around the lily," ("When she overspread her face, fair as the lily, with her curling locks, waving as the hyacinth.")

هفت هزار و شصت و یک چشم در کف می را (hyacinth,") "The execution of her bright and piercing eyes resembling the NUCIS, was encreased in the proportion of a thousand fold*."




It would require the space of a large Dictionary to illustrate in detail the ordinary application of Persian metaphors, familiar to the natives of that country, though often unintelligible to the English reader, because they are wholly unknown to the English Tongue. I shall therefore only remark, on this subject, that many of those metaphors are highly beautiful in my estimation, and that the imputed absurdity of many others, has no existence but in the imagination of those who do not understand them. It is a common fault of the English readers of Persian Poetry, to mistake or extend beyond its proper limits the *نقطه التماس* or POINT OF COMPARISON; yet no simile can be reasonably condemned or applauded until the point of comparison shall be first ascertained. Thus it happens, that when a Persian Poet compares the face of his mistress to the FULL MOON, the figure is apt to present an idea highly disagreeable to the mind of many an English reader, who pictures to himself a woman with a face large and round as a mathematical circle; utterly destitute of true symmetry, and swelled and bloated in such a manner, as can result only from the grossest intemperance. Now what is the idea conveyed by the same metaphor to the mind of the Persian Poet who employs it, or to that of his reader who is really conversant in the idiom and genius of the Persian Tongue? Why certainly, I think, it is that so finely described by Mr. POPE in the following eminently beautiful lines.

* The employment of the *نقطه التماس* to supply the place of the *تشبیه* as *نقطه التماس* THE NAME OF A FLOWER, which is employed in the text to signify THE EYE, is not generally treated as a SIMILE by the Arabian Writers, who describe it as one species of the *تشبیه* or METAPHOR. Now the Arabian Writers are certainly in the right; but as a METAPHOR is merely "A short simile," or "A simile expressed by a single word," I have not thought it necessary to distinguish between them, and have generally employed the term METAPHOR in the sense of a SIMILE, or vice versa, whether consisting of one or of many words.

So

So when the Sun's broad beams have tired the sight,
 All mild ascends the Moon's more sober light;
 SERENE IN VIRGIN MODESTY SHE SHINES,
 While unobserved the glaring orb declines.

Now I have no intention to defend, broadly, the general purity of Persian metaphors, many of which are certainly absurd and remote in the highest degree; but since it cannot be denied that the same metaphor will often convey the opposite sensations of delight or distaste, according to the aspect under which it is viewed, it becomes a matter of justice to the Persian Poets, to pause on the meaning of each metaphor, and not to pronounce sentence of condemnation, until the point of comparison shall be first ascertained. The reader who is guided by this principle, will not fail to find his reward in the discovery of many beauties imperceptible to the eye of a common observer, to whom the finest metaphors of the language are obscured or distorted by the mist of his own ignorance; and he will speedily perceive a very prominent distinction between the similes of the English and the Persian Language, the nature of which I am now to explain, if it has not been already divined by the reader.

It is enough, I believe, to stamp the character of a good simile, that there shall exist in the  some ONE ATTRIBUTE OF PROMINENT QUALITY, on which alone the simile is founded; and there is not the least occasion that the  shall resemble the , in any one of its other qualities. Thus a Poet, speaking of a warrior in the field, might certainly describe him as a "LION roused in his strength;" &c. but no man in his senses would thence infer that the Poet means to impute to his hero, *all* the qualities that distinguish a LION; but merely those prominent qualities of STRENGTH and COURAGE, on which alone the simile is founded. The common usage of the English Language does, nevertheless, in this example

as in most others, require that the resemblance between the **مُسْتَبِيح**, and the **مُسْتَبِيح** shall be of a much more obvious, general and extensive nature than is necessary to the accuracy of a Persian simile; and thence it happens that the **مُسْتَبِيح** is generally presented IN TOTO to the mind of an English reader, while the Persian Poet thinks of nothing but that SINGLE QUALITY in the **مُسْتَبِيح**, on which alone the simile is founded.

To explain by an example. The term **مُسْتَبِيح** A CANDLE, among the Persian Poets, is commonly employed to signify, a beautiful woman; and nothing surely can be more repugnant than such a metaphor, to the idiom and genius of the English Language: **آن شمع شبی** "That CANDLE approached me one night;" &c. But the epithet **بخش آفرود** GIVING LIGHT TO THE ASSEMBLY, might be certainly applied in our Language to a beautiful woman; (" O! she doth teach the torches to burn bright;" &c.) and this is the only attribute of a candle, that enters into the mind of the Persian Poet, who takes occasion to apply the term **مُسْتَبِيح** to his mistress. In this point of view, the term **مُسْتَبِيح**, so applied, has perhaps unexceptionable propriety; but whatever judgment may be formed of its beauty, we are bound, in common candor, to admit that the Persian Poet is not responsible for the ignorance of his English reader, who extends the comparison a great deal too far, ascribing, perhaps, every other attribute of a candle to the Poet's mistress; such as shape, color, &c. and forgetting only that single attribute, (**بخش آفرود**) which forms, in reality, the **نقطهٔ تشبیه** or true "Point of comparison;" and is alone present to the Poet's mind. Such are the errors of conception, into which men fall, who will not take the pains to distinguish, in Language, the influence of idiom, from that of reason; and are consequently apt to impute absurdity to every phrase, in a foreign Language, which is at variance,

riance, not with the principles of sound reason, but merely with the idiom of their native Tongue. I return from this digression, in order to detail, in the form of general rules, the few observations that occur on the subject of the proper application of the word **لَیْکَ** Like, to the purposes of Speech.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE word **لَیْکَ** Like, is very commonly employed to establish the **SIMILITUDE** between the **مُشَبَّه** and the **مُشَبَّهٌ بِهِ**, when both shall happen to be **مُفْرَد**; the term **مُفْرَد** being opposed, in point of sense, to the term **مُجْمَع**; and consequently applicable to a single noun, or to any part of a sentence which is less than the whole. Examples: **يَا رَمِ جُونِ قَمَرًا أَت** "My mistress is like the moon;" **وَرُخْ يَادِ جُونِ نَخْتِ رَا أَت** "The cheeks of my beloved resemble the flower of the pomegranate;" **عَاشِقِ بِي زَرِ جُونِ مَرُغِ بِي بَرَا أَت** "A lover without money, is like a bird without feathers;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE word **لَیْکَ** Like, is very commonly employed to establish the **SIMILITUDE** between the **مُشَبَّه** and the **مُشَبَّهٌ بِهِ**, when the former shall be a **مُجْمَع**, and the latter a **مُفْرَد**. Examples: **دُرُ شَبِّ فِرَاقِشِ جُونِ شَمْعِ مِی کِهَ اَزَم** "During the nights of her absence, I burn like a candle;" &c. In this case, the **مُشَبَّهٌ بِهِ** generally occurs in the middle of a sentence; except in poetry, where it may occur any where. Examples: **بُو مُرغانِ خُصَنانِ دِیدِ زَبانِ بَسْتِ اَز سُنِّی جَامِی** "JAUMEE has ceased to sing, like the birds in autumn;" **خَلَقِی قَبْلِشِ خُفَ زَمَانِ دَر بَحْنِ جُو مَل** "The people are laughing in the garden, like the rose;" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

When the مُشَبَّه happens to be a مُقَسَّر, the مُشَبَّه will rarely be a مُجَسَّم in the Persian Language; though some examples of that kind might be found or made: as زید را دیدم چون شیر بر آسمان نازد "I saw ZYDE (rush on his enemies) as a lion rushes on a flag;" &c. In this case, the common usage of the Persian Language requires the use of the PARTICLE که زید را در منته که دیدم چون شیری که بر آسمان نازد; "I saw ZYDE in the field of battle, (rush on his enemies,) as a lion that rushes on the hind;" &c. or the use of an ADJECTIVE OR COMPOUND EPITHET: as دلم در فراقش چون ماهی از آب دور افتد; "My heart, in her absence, resembles a fish out of the water;" &c. And in either case, the مُشَبَّه ceases to be a مُجَسَّم, and becomes a مُقَسَّر as already explained.

RULE FOURTH.

In a simile formed of two perfect sentences, one of which is the مُشَبَّه, and the other the مُشَبَّه بِهِ, the word چون Like will be rarely employed, except in poetry. Example: میگذرد بجزبه از ان باد گرد "ALEXANDER trembled at that whirlwind;" "چون برگ خزان لرزد از باد سرد" As a leaf in autumn trembles at the wind;" &c. The common usage of the Persian Language requires, in this case, the use of the particle که after the مُشَبَّه بِهِ. Example: ذرات کائنات بمنصور تو قائم اند "The atoms of existence are supported by thee;" (literally, "by thy Sun," because atoms are visible only in the rays of the Sun;) "چون عالم مافات که قائم بود بذات" As the attributes of matter, (such as length, breadth, &c.) are supported by the matter in which they exist."

CONCLUSION.

CONCLUSION.

THE nature of a **SIMILE** implies a distinction between the **مُشَبَّه**, and the **مُشَبِّه**; because, in strict accuracy, a thing cannot be compared with itself, though some examples of that kind have been discovered and ridiculed in English poetry: as "None but himself can be his parallel." The incontestible absurdity of this phrase consists, I suppose, in the form of expression; for the idea of the writer is very clearly conveyed; *namely*, that "The person alluded to, has no equal;" and in this, there is no absurdity at all. I say the idea of the writer is very clearly conveyed, because the act of comparing a man with himself, is merely a form of hyperbole, introduced for an obvious purpose of speech; *namely*, that of indicating that there is not, in the world, an object with which he can be justly compared. In the Persian Language, and I believe in every other Tongue, it often happens that the **مُشَبَّه** and the **مُشَبِّه** are in reality descriptive of the same object; and, in this case, we have the *form* but not the *substance* of a simile; which always implies, as already stated, a distinction between the **مُشَبَّه** and the **مُشَبِّه**. Thus we may say of a man that "Having an understanding such as he possesses," or "Having a mind like his mind, it is quite incredible that he should have been guilty of the follies imputed to him;" and as the man cannot possibly have two minds, one of which is compared to the other, it follows obviously, that there is not here the *substance* but merely the *form* of a simile, because the mind of the man is compared with itself. The examples of this nature are very numerous in the Persian Language: as **شَفِیعی چون من و چون او غلامی** "With such an intercessor as I am, and such a servant as he is;"

چو تو بخت بدی گستر ز جامی "And such a king as you are, shall we fail in our object, which is a mere trifle?" or literally,

" which is less than a glass of wine " The words " shall we fail in our object," are omitted in the original, with the usual brevity of the Persian Poets, which is often such as to obscure the sense. I have nothing more to observe on the nature and application of the word **چون** LIKE; often contracted in poetry into **چ**; and shall now proceed to consider, in their order, the numerous compounds that are formed from it.

چون LIKE.

THE application of this word to the purposes of speech, is precisely similar to that of **چون**, inasmuch that either may be accurately substituted for the other in every example that can be adduced. Example: **صبح دَوات می دَمد کو جام، سَچون آفتاب**
 " The morning of fortune dawns upon me, bring me a cup that resembles the SUN;" &c. The word **چون**, however, is perhaps most commonly translated by **مثل** LIKE; in opposition to **سَچون**, which is most commonly translated by the word **نماين** RESEMBLING. I know not why it should be so, nor whether the fact does, in reality, constitute any essential distinction between them. It seems to me that the word **سَچون** has in it somewhat more of force and emphasis than the word **چون**.

**چنان چسُون چسُو چومان چونا،
چنين چنين چنين**

THESE are various forms of the words **چنان** and **چنين**, which are alone commonly employed in the Language; the other forms being chiefly or entirely restricted to the writings of the ancient Poets. Examples: **نکويم کيش چنان با د و چسُون با و** " I do not pray that he may be so and so;" **چنانداري چسُو بر تخت نه نشست** " A Prince like him never sat on a throne;" **چسُون چسُون چسُون چسُون** " Such are the palaces of the

the CÆSARS of ROME;” **چنین بود و چنین بود** “Such the world has always been, and such it will always continue to be;” &c. It is unnecessary to inform the reader that they are compounded of the word **چون** LIKE, and the demonstrative nouns **آن** THAT, and **این** THIS; with the exception, perhaps, of the word **بسی**; in which the demonstrative nouns are probably superceded by the pronoun **او** HE, SHE, or IT. The word **چون** has been always of rare occurrence in the Language, and may be now regarded as completely obsolete.

THE demonstrative nouns naturally imply a reference to the **مشارک**; and if the latter shall happen to be expressed in the sentence, it may be a single noun: as **چنان کس در جهان پیدا نیست** “There is no such man as that in the world;” **و چنین آدم در عالم نبوده است** “Nor any such man as this in the universe;” or it may be the sense of a sentence: as **هر چه زید می کند بکر نیز چنان می تواند کرد** “Whatever ZYDE does, that, or such as that, BUKR can do also;” where the demonstrative THAT, which forms a component part of the word **چنان**, is obviously applicable to the sense of the preceding sentence **هر چه زید می کند** “Whatever ZYDE does;” or, in other words, “to the actions of ZYDE.” In either of these cases, the practical application of the words **چنان** and **چنین** to the purposes of Speech, is of a nature too plain to admit of illustration by the rules of Grammar.

BUT it sometimes happens that there is nothing, either expressed or understood in the sentence, to which the sense of the demonstrative nouns comprised in the words **چنان** and **چنین**, can be accurately and easily referred: as in the example:

ample: بازید چنان و چنین گفتم. "I said such and such things to ZYDE;" &c. The words چنان and چنین, so employed, have been assigned by the Persian Grammarians to the class of the ذکات (SEE PAGE 147, OF THIS VOLUME;) and they really convey no distinct information of any kind, being intelligible, like other words of that class, such as فلان A CERTAIN PERSON OR THING, &c. to those only who have some previous knowledge of the persons or things to which we allude. The obscurity inherent in all such phrases may, nevertheless, be partially removed by the introduction of a given substantive noun which is therefore termed the تمیز (SEE PAGE 223 OF THIS VOLUME,) as چنان اسب بریدم. "I gave such and such a horse to ZYDE;" or it may be wholly destroyed by means of a sentence following the particle که: as چنان شش زخم بر سر که منهدمش در دهان افکند. "I will so beat his head with a stone, that his brains shall fall into his mouth;" &c.

آنچنان این چنین آنچنان

THE words آنچنان and این چنین are undistinguished in their application, so far as I have been able to observe, from the simpler forms چنان and چنین: and the same observation may be extended to آنچنان, and اینچنین, which have, however, somewhat more of force and emphasis than the former. Example: سایر مائش بر نعمت و ثبات آراسته. "His outward condition was adorned with the wealth of the world;" و نیست نفس چنان در وی منتگین. "But his natural meanness of soul continued just as before;" &c.

چنانکه

چُنْ نِمَ چُنْ نِمَ

THESE TWO words are nearly synonymous, and are now of constant occurrence in the Language, though one of them (چُنْ نِمَ) seems to have been rarely used by the writers of ancient Persia. The following are all the rules that I have been able to collect in the Language, on the subject of their application to the purposes of Speech.

RULE FIRST.

They are very commonly employed to compare together the sense of two sentences, one of which is the مُشَبَّه, and the other the مُشَبِّه. Example:

“ناگا، از ظلمتِ دُخا، یارِ خانه ز روشنائیِ بستان” Suddenly a light shone from amidst the darkness of the lobby of the house;”

“چُنْ نِمَ دُرُ شَبِّ نَارِ صَبْحِ بَرِ آید” As the morning dawns after a dark night;”

“یا آبِ حیات از مُسَاوِاتِ مَدِ رَأید” Or as the water of life emerges from the midst of darkness.”

In this case, the sentence comprising the مُشَبِّه may precede the other which contains the مُشَبَّه: as

“چُنْ نِمَ تُو مَتَوَسَّسِ اَسَنِ دُرُ جِهانِ کَسِ مَتَوَسَّسِ نَاشد” There is not in the world such an unfortunate as you;” &c.

And a part of the sentence comprising the مُشَبِّه may be accurately omitted, if it be of such a nature that the reader is able to

supply the omission. Example:

“بَارِ مَشِجْ کَدِ اِمِ اِشْتانِ مَبْیَلِ وَ مَحْجَمِی نَدِ اَرَد” He does not love any of them;”

“چُنْ نِمَ مَ اَبا ز” So much as he loves AYAUZ;”

&c. The following is an example of the occurrence of

چُنْ نِمَ in the same sense. “فَرَمُو دَنادِشْ نوْشِرَوانِ بَکْشِ دَنَد” He gave orders to open the tomb of NOWSHERAWAUN;”

“و بَدِ اِنْجَا دُرِ آید و بَدِ نَازِ دُرِ خَاکِ مَنَسْ” And having entered it, he saw

law the body fresh and uncorrupted;"

چون بزم شخمس در خواب باشد "As a man who sleeps;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THEY are commonly employed to indicate the relation of EXEMPLIFICATION, known in Grammar by the term **تمثیل**.

Example: **هزار شمی که در آخرش های محقق باشد** "Every noun ending in the gentle aspirate;

عند الائناب بگات غیمی مبدل گردد forms the relative by changing that letter into *Gauf*:"

چون نیم دیوانگی "as for example **دیوانگی**;" which is formed from **دیوانه** MAD. This

relation approaches very nearly to that signified by the term **مقایسه** or COMPARISON; with this difference, that the

in the case of **تمثیل**, is an example adduced in illustration of a given rule, or a given observation; which is not true of a common simile, in which two things are merely compared together.

R U L E T H I R D.

THEY may be accurately employed to combine together two sentences connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT.

Example: **روزی از بام ناشام رفتم** "I walked one day from morning to night;"

چون بزم مانده و کوفته شدم "Infomuch that I was fatigued and weary;" &c. Or to indicate

the relation signified by the terms **غایت و غرض** in which case, they are followed, like the PARTICLE **تا**, by a sentence significant of the END or PURPOSE for which a given

action is to be, or may have been, performed. Example:

عقوبت کسی مگر چون نجو عیب تو نم کسی نگوید "Do not censure other men, that they may not censure you;" &c.

R U L E

RULE FOURTH.

THEY are very commonly employed to indicate the HOPE or DESIRE of the Speaker for the occurrence of a given event, signified by the sentence to which they are prefixed: and in this case, they correspond very nearly, in point of sense, with the word **کاش** **WOULD IT WERE SO; OR WOULD IT MAY BE SO; &c.** Examples: **اگر چنت نچه منتسب من باشی** "If (would it were so) you will consent not to give us any trouble," **و هر روز وقت ما را برباشی** "And not daily to destroy our comfort," **ما را کاری به اینست که ما را بیاوریم** "We will send you every morning game sufficient for the provision of your Majesty's kitchen." **اگر چنت نچه تو را بیاوریم آن بردارند** "If (would it were so) you will direct the attention of your mind to the completion of it;" &c. The words **باشد و باشد** are most probably understood in all the Examples of this class, after the word **چنت** which does not therefore, in all probability, suffer any real fluctuation of sense.

RULE FIFTH.

THEY are not unfrequently employed to indicate the PROXIMITY, in point of time, of the occurrence of two given events comprised in either member of the sentence by which they are followed: and in this case, they correspond very nearly, in point of sense, with the word **چون** **WHEN**, as already explained. Example: **چنت نچه زید آمد صبح دیش** "As ZYDE arrived," or "When ZYDE arrived, the morning broke;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE words **چنت نچه** and **چنت نچه** have somewhat more of force and emphasis than the simpler forms **چنت**; but the word

word **جَنِبَنِي** is of rare occurrence except in the writings of modern times. Examples: **وَيَدُهُ أَهْلُ طَمَحٍ بِهِ تَسْتَمِتُ وَنَبَا** "The eyes of the avaricious (cannot be filled) by the wealth of this world;" **هَرَفُ نَفْسٍ وَهَجْنُ نَكَمٍ جَسَدٍ نَسْنَمُ** "As a well cannot be filled with nightly dew." **نَقْمُجَنِي بِنَفْرَتِ نَيْعِ جَنِّ سَوْزٍ** "As by the strokes of your sword destroying the world," **سَاحَتِ سَرَايَ فَا نِي رَا دَر قَبْدِ قَبْطِ مِي آ رِي** "you bring under subjection the expanse of this transitory world;" **بِه بَرَكَتِ عَسَلِ عَالَمِ اَقْرُو زِي** "So, by the means of your justice enlightening the world," **نَسَبِ سَمَا وَتِ بَاتِي رَا سَمِ دَر قَبْقَعِ اِسْتِغْنَانِ وَرَا وَرِي** "You ought to bring under subjection to the grasp of your merit, the kingdom of eternal happiness in a future state;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

HAVING furnished the preceding examples of the practical application of the words **جَنِبَنِي** and **جَنِبَنِي** to the purposes of speech, it remains for me to observe, as usual, that I am very indifferent about the decision of the question that relates to the **UNITY OR OTHERWISE**, of the sense of these words, in every example that can be adduced. I am as much disposed as any of my readers, to believe that they have no real fluctuations of sense; but however that question may be decided, the utility of the examples adduced by me will be equally defensible in either case: since those examples unquestionably furnish the facts, with reference to which, our opinions on the subject must be ultimately formed.

It is worthy of remark that there are no such words in the Language as **جَنِبَنِي** and **جَنِبَنِي**; though the analogous formation of **جَنِبَنِي** and **جَنِبَنِي** might reasonably give birth to an expectation

pectation of their existence. The particle **که**, occurring after the word **چنین**, does not therefore coalesce with that word : **چنین که یار مرا روی خوب و خوبی نداشت** "Such is the beautiful face and fine temper of my beloved;" &c. nor does that particle coalesce with **چنان**, when the word **چنان** is employed as a **نعت** : **چنان سخت و درشت شد که نگاری نباید** "When he becomes rough and disagreeable, or loses the beauty and fineness of youth, so that he is no longer an object of desire;" &c. In either case, the following is the natural order of the sentence : **چنین روی خوب که یار مرا است** ; **چنان سخت و درشت شد که نگاری نباید** ; &c. I have nothing more to observe on the practical application of the derivatives formed from the word **چون** ; and shall proceed, therefore, to consider the nature and application of the word **خدا**.

خدا

As a noun, this word is properly the name of the **DEITY** : in which sense, some Etymologists consider it as a contraction for **خود آیی** COMING OF HIS OWN ACCORD ; or **UNCREATED**. Compounded with another word, it has the sense of **LORD** ; **MASTER** ; **PROPRIETOR** ; &c. as **خانه خدا** "The master of the house;" **کشور خدا** "The ruler of the kingdom;" **ده خدا** "The lord of the village;" **کشتی خدا** or **کشتی خدا** "The master of the house;" **کشتی خدا** "The captain of a ship;" &c. N. B. The word **کشتی** or **کشت** signifies A HOUSE ; and **کشتی** is a contraction for **کشتی** A SHIP or A BOAT.

خس

As a common substantive noun, this word signifies AN ASS ; but it is prefixed to a considerable number of words in the Language, in the sense of **LARGE** ; **COARSE** ; &c. as **خسبوت**

A LARGE MULBERRY; **خسب** A LARGE STONE; **خسروش**
 A LARGE MOUSE; OF A RAT; **خسگوس** A LARGE FLY;
خسچتر A CRAB; (because of his large claws;) **خسرس**, a
 contraction for **خسرآمن** A LARGE HEAP OF ANY THING, but
 more especially of GRAIN; **خسبزر** properly A LARGE FRUIT;
 but now A WATER-MELON; though some people pronounce
 the word **خسبز**; because they believe it to be a contrac-
 tion for **خوزبزر** RIPENED BY THE SUN.

دار

THIS is the contracted form of the participle **دارنده** as
دارنده WEALTHY; **بوی دار** ODORIFEROUS; **پرده دار** HOLD-
 IND THE VEIL; **دیدار** A SENTINEL, or "One stationed to
 keep watch on an eminence;" **راه دار** "An officer having
 charge of the public roads;" **خوب نشین دار** "One who keeps
 himself clear of evil;" &c. as **کسی بهتر از خوب نشین دار نیست**
 "There is no man better than he is, who keeps himself clear
 of evil."

در

THIS word, though now generally considered as a parti-
 cle, was probably a **نقرب** in former times; being follow-
 ed, in that character, by the mark of the IZAFUT; like the
 word **درون** WITHIN, which is now a **نقرب**, and therefore
 indispensibly requires that mark. Ex: **نگر کرد و دوری در غله دید**
 "He looked and beheld an ant in the grain;" &c. The
 mark of the IZAFUT is now generally omitted after **در**,
 which is therefore thought to have assumed the character of
 a PARTICLE; whether accurately or otherwise, I leave to be
 determined by the judgment of the reader; *first*, because I
 think it a matter of little importance whether we call it a

NOUN

NOUN or a PARTICLE; and, *secondly*, because I am really at some loss to form a decided opinion on the subject. Mr. Tooke's disciples will probably trace its origin to the substantive ر, A DOOR; but admitting the accuracy of that etymology, it is entirely unimportant in my estimation. I do not believe that the word ر, IN, suffers any real fluctuations of sense; but think it necessary, nevertheless, to offer in the form of general rules, such observations as occur on the subject of its practical use.

RULE FIRST.

THE PROPER and the IMPROPER ZURE, as explained in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 122 OF THIS VOLUME, are very commonly governed by the preposition ر, IN; which denotes, in this case, the relation signified by the term *تَرْفِيقٌ*: connecting together the *مُتَرْفِقٌ* or THING CONTAINED, and the *مَرْفِقٌ* or THAT IN WHICH IT IS CONTAINED. Example:

یا در اقدوباغ بزدیم "Zyde is in the house;"
 "I took my friend into the garden;" در روز رسیدیم
 "I slept or rested in arrived in the day;" در شب آریبیم
 "I looked at or in the face of the night;" نقش در رخ پیا کردیم
 "I was lost in thought;" در فکر فرو رفتم
 "I was involved in misery;" در بلاء گرفتار شدم
 This is the true sense of the word ر; to which, in all probability, the examples detailed in the following rules might be accurately and reasonably referred.

RULE SECOND.

It is found, occasionally, to denote the relation of ASSOCIATION; known in Grammar by the term *مُتَابَعَةٌ*. Example:
 "I arrived at Koofa in company with" در کار واری بگو فر رسیدیم

a caravan," &c. Or the relation of EXALFATION, known in Grammar by the term **إِسْتِغْلَالٌ**, and more commonly signified by the word **بِ** ON. Examples:

وَرَأَوْجُ لَافِتٍ بِ تُوْزِيْبِ تَسْمِي بَيْتٍ "There is no such moon as you are, shining IN or ON the summit of all that is graceful;" كَلَامٌ دَر سِرِّ كَرْدَمِ "I put the cap ON (literally IN) my head;" اَنْكَشَرِي دَر اَنْكَشْتِ كَرْدَمِ "I put the ring ON (literally IN) my finger." In the two last examples, it is worthy of remark that the **تَرَف** and the **مَنْظُوف** have changed places; since we put our head in a cap, and not the cap in our head; &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

It is found, occasionally, to denote the relation of CAUSATION; known in Grammar by the term **سَبَبِيَّت**, and more commonly signified by the word **أَز**. Example:

دَر عِيْشِقِ تُوْزِيْشِ دَوَايِ بِنِ كَشْتَمِ "I have become the scorn of the world because of my love for you;" &c. Or that other species of CAUSATION, which is known, by the terms

دَر كَشْتَنِ اَوْ سَتَنِ بِلِ قَايِدِ تُوْزِيْشِ. Example: وَخَرَضَ غَايِبَتِ "They laboured ineffectually to bring about his death; &c.

Or the relation of JUNCTION; known in Grammar by the term **إِصْطِق**, and more commonly signified by the preposition **بِ**. Example: دَاغِشِ مَلِ بِرِيْجَتِ وَ دَر دَاغِشِ اَوْجَتِ "He flung down the roses, and laid hold of my lappet;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

It is occasionally employed to denote certain other specific relations, the classification of which, after having furnished a few examples, I shall leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader, since the shades of difference between the nature

nature of one specific relation and another, are often so close as to be nearly evanescent. Examples:

زید در آذران چون ماه است در سیارگان "Zyde among his brothers, resembles the moon among the stars;"

تم در نو گریزم ار گریزم "If I fly at all, I shall fly to you;"

بوسه بده ای شمع که در پای تو میترام "Give me a kiss, O my beloved! may I die at your feet;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE already stated my opinion that the word در has no real fluctuations of sense, though the diversity of idiom that obtains in the English and Persian Tongues, does, undoubtedly, render it applicable to many propositions which cannot be accurately expressed in our Language by means of its synonyme, the word in. As applicable to the infinitive and the tenses of a Persian verb, the word در may be often a PERIPHRASIS: as در گفتن "To speak;" در آمدن "To open;" &c. or it may be often significant; in which case, it is exactly opposed, in point of sense, to the word بر: as در آمدن To come in; or To enter; بر آمدن To come out; or To come forth; در آوردن To bring in; بر آوردن To bring out; &c.

دش Like دش.

THESE two words were formerly self-significant, and for aught I know to the contrary, may be so still. Example: نریخته و نه بسته ترا میبینی کس "No man ever saw, or will see," اگر رزم مثل دیگران دش "Your equal either in the field or cabinet." At present, they are of rare occurrence in the Language, being added, in the way of terminations, to the end of certain substantive nouns: as قور و دش "Like the

شَدِيدَس or شَدَس "Like heaven;" هَلْد و شَس "the sun;"
 "Like the body;" and therefore "A picture:" as
 هَزَار شَكْل دَر اَن شَكْل دَشَدَس دَل بَر "In it, were a thousand
 various forms and pictures of beautiful women;" &c.

دَبُو, A DEMON.

IN the sense of A DEMON, this word is the root or primitive from which is formed دَبُوَك or دَبُوَر "The name of an insect destructive of books." It is otherwise employed, like the word خَسَر, to signify LARGE, when prefixed to certain substantive nouns: as دَبُوَكَن "A large bow;" دَبُوَكُوخ "A large clod;" دَبُوَا "A spider;" because of the length or size of his legs; دَبُوَا "A tempest;" or "A whirlwind;" دَبُوَشَنب "The name of a large species of grain;" &c.

ر ر

THE termination ر ر has not, perhaps, any real fluctuations of sense; being invariably employed to indicate the relation of APPROPRIATION, known in Grammar by the term اِنْخِصَاص, and commonly expressed by the word بَرَايَ FOR. To this general sense of the termination ر ر, it is probable, that every example of its occurrence in the Language may be accurately and reasonably referred: as زَبَدَر از دَم "I beat ZYDE;" which is equivalent to the phrase "I appropriated to ZYDE, or performed on ZYDE, the action signified by the verb To beat." (SEE REMARKS, PAGE 199 OF THIS VOLUME.) The relation of APPROPRIATION is very general, and may be therefore resolved into a considerable number of specific relations, the nature of which I shall endeavour to detail in the following rules.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It is occasionally employed to indicate the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term سببیت, and more commonly expressed by the preposition از. Example: جُشَنِ اَدَمِي مُرْدِ مَرِه تَنگ رَا "It is better that such a man should die of disgrace;" that is to say, "by reason of disgrace;" &c. It seems also to supply the place of the preposition از in other examples of a different nature: as زِدَر اَبَر سَبَدَنَد "It is related of ZYDE;" "They asked of ZYDE;" that is to say, "They asked of ZYDE such and such questions;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is occasionally employed to indicate the relation of EXCHANGE OR OPPOSITION;" known in Grammar by the terms مَدْل and مُتَبَدِّل. Example: مَرَارُ رُو سِه رَا اَسْتِ خَرِیْدِم "I purchased a horse for a thousand rupees;" &c. It is also pretty frequently employed in the sense of the prepositions در and بَر. Examples: شَب رَا بَرِ تَنانِ بَا یَکِ اَز دُوشَنانِ اِتْفَاقِ مَبِیتِ اُفْتَد "I happened to remain in or FOR the night, in a garden with one of my friends;" رَهْمَتِی بَر حَسانِ مُسْتَمَانِ کُنِ کِه رَهْمَتِ وَاجِبِ اَسْت "Have compassion on the life or soul of SULMAN, for it behoves you to pity اَسْت وَکَلِ اَسْت "a wretch whose load is fallen into the mud." (زَرْتَمَتِ وَاجِبِ اَسْت بَر نَا تَوَالِی) &c.

RULE FIFTH.

It is occasionally employed to govern the noun by which we swear. Example: مِی تَوِیْدِ کِه شَکِیْمِه مَآم اَز یَکُوَان "My enemies

enemies say, HOOMAUM is given to the love of beautiful women;" *راشقی را هر که جان دارد بدیشان مایل است* "And in truth, (I swear by truth,) whoever is possessed of a soul is disposed to love them." Or to govern a noun introduced for the purpose of indicating SURPRISE or ASTONISHMENT. Example: *دل آزمی ز دور و آزمی نهان کرد* "She robbed me of my heart and withdrew from my sight;" *خدا را با که این بازی توان کرد* "Heavens! who is to be mocked in such a manner as this!" I know not whether the termination *را*, in the word *نفس را*, "By chance," or more properly "By the irrevocable decrees of Providence or Destiny," is not properly of the same nature. Example: *نفس را طیب اندر آن شب بمرد* "As fate would have it, the physician died that night." In the following example, it seems to me to indicate the relation of ADJURATION: *خدا را بر من ببیدل بخشای* "For God's sake, have compassion on me who have lost my heart."

RULE SIXTH.

It is often employed to supply the place of the *Izarur*: *first*, when any one or more words occur between the *منف* and the *الیه*, the former taking precedence in the order of Speech; and, *secondly*, when the *الیه* precedes the *منف*, with or without the intervention of any other word. Examples: *تا رخ خوشت نبینم دل نیا ساید مرا* "My heart will never be happy (دل من نیا ساید) until I obtain a sight of your fine face;" *عصدا پسر زنگ رنجور بود* "The son of Azood (پسر عصدا) was very ill;" *جی را چون دل بدست کسی* "There was a man who, like me, had lost his heart to his mistress;" *(دل یکی چون دل من الی اخیر)* &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It is occasionally employed to indicate the relation of JUNCTION; known in Grammar by the term **الِصاق**, and more commonly signified by the preposition **بِ**. Example: **بِمَطْلُوبٍ رَسَيْدَم** or, which is the same thing, **مَطْلُوبٍ رَا رَسَيْدَم** "I attained my object." Of this nature, I believe, is the Example **فَلَانٌ كَيْتَ بَزِيدٍ رَا دَا دَمَ وَنَحْشِيدَم** "I gave such and such a book to ZYDE;" &c. It occurs also in the sense of **نَزْد** as **بِرَبِّهِی دَا رَدِ حَسَابِ اَز تَوَجُّجِ لَبِّ قَسَبِ** "Would that the morning breeze would fling aside the veil that conceals the beauty of LYLEE;" **نَاخِلَا یَنْ رَا شُدُورُوشَن کِه نَحْشُونِ عَسَائِلِ اَنْتَ** "For then mankind might perceive (نَزْدِ خِلَا یَنْ رُو شَن شُدُورُوشَن) that MUJNOON (is not frantic as they have supposed, and as the name implies, but) retains the possession of all his faculties." In other words, "Such is the transcendent beauty of LYLEE, as to justify the apparently frantic actions of her lover MUJNOON." The reader will perceive that the lines have not been translated literally. The termination **ا ر** is also occasionally employed in the sense of the word **جَانِب** as **اَنْتَبَ بَانِی رَا رُو یِ آ ر** "Turn your face to the kingdom of eternity;" &c.

R U L E E I G H T H.

It is sometimes employed to govern the noun significant of the END OR PURPOSE (**غَا یَتِ وَ غَرَضُ**) to be effected by the occurrence of a given event specified in the sentence with which it is connected. Example: **نَا یَمَتِ مَحْضُ اَنْتَ اِکْرَامَتِ جَسَنِ آفَرِیْنِ** "It is the highest benefit (wisdom) if the bounty of the CREATOR;" **خَاصِ کُنَدِ بَسَنْدِ مَعَالَمَتِ عَامِ رَا** "Selects one of his creatures for the general good;" &c. Or to indicate a CHANGE from

from one state to another; known in Grammar by the term *مَبْرُورَت*. Example: *ما تمسه تر دن را پنداشده ایم* "We are all born to die;" *و وزیرایی را آبادان گشته ایم* "And flourish, to decay;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

It seems to me that the relation of APPROPRIATION may be easily traced in all the examples adduced in illustration of the preceding rules, and in a great variety of other examples, perhaps too numerous to be comprised in any Grammatical treatise whatever: as *ما را کتاب بخت و کار است* "I want a dictionary;" *خواجمر را پند ز نادیر اثن بود* "A gentleman had a slave of extraordinary beauty;" *گل بوستان را بخت بی بنیت* "The roses of the garden have no permanency;" *شکر و سپاس و نعمت و رحمت خدای را* "All praise and gratitude is due to God;" &c. I shall therefore only farther observe, on this subject, that the termination *ا*, seems to be sometimes, though rarely, a mere pleonasm: as

خشم آن فرخنده سابع را که چشم "Happy is that fortunate man whose eyes, *آؤفته بر روی تو هر باه او* are every morning directed to your face;" unless (which is possible) the word *خشم* be here employed in the sense of the substantive *خشمی* HAPPINESS.

THE intelligent reader will alter, if necessary, according to the dictates of his own judgment, the arrangement of the examples which I have adduced in order to illustrate the practical application of the termination *ا*, to the purposes of Speech. He will supply, from his own observation, such examples, omitted by me, as may be necessary to the more perfect elucidation of the subject; and having collected all the facts of the case, he will then

then proceed to adopt the arrangement, which I have proposed, or to substitute, if that shall be deemed advisable, any other that may, in his estimation, furnish a nearer approximation to the truth. Believing that the plan which is here adopted in imitation of the writers on Arabic Grammar, is the very best that can be devised for the attainment of an accurate conception of the nature and use of the Persian particles, I am not the less conscious that its execution is defective in all probability, and therefore susceptible of much improvement. I have marked out the path which leads to success, but the reader who desires to pursue it with advantage, will have occasion for the exertion of his own industry, in the removal of those impediments which may have escaped the industry of my enquiries, and will therefore continue to to lie in his way.

زنده، زنده

EACH of these words is commonly employed in the sense of LARGE: as زنده، پسنل or زنده، پسنل "A large elephant;" "A large river;" &c. Ex. هتی زنت نازان سوی زنده، پسنل "He rushed to assault that raging (or literally large) elephant;" "Roaring loud as the river Nile;" &c. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the word زنده، LIVING, is the participle of the verb زین To LIVE.

زیرا

THIS word has already been twice noticed in PAGES 441 AND 462 OF THIS VOLUME, to which the reader is therefore referred. It is generally followed by the particle که, but sometimes by چو: as زیراکه or زیراچو; both words having precisely the same sense.

زخار

زَنَبَر HAVE A CARE:

There is little to be said of this word, which is employed to corroborate or confirm the proposition comprised in that member of the sentence to which it is annexed. Examples: "Have a care that you console the weak or unfortunate;" **زَنَبَر مَكْنِ نَكْتَبِه كِه بُسْجَاد نَدَارَد** "Have a care that you do not depend (on fortune,) for it has no foundation;" &c. As a noun, it has various senses: as **زَنَبَر دِخْوَاه** "A breaker of engagements;" **زَنَبَر رَا از قَرَبِنِ بَدِ زَنَبَر** "One who demands protection;" **زَنَبَر** "Protect us (or literally, Protection!) against a bad wife;" &c. In the last example, I suppose the verb **دَد**, Give, or something equivalent, is understood in the sentence; and so, also, of other examples in which the word **زَنَبَر** is followed by the preposition **از**.

زِي TOWARDS.

This word, which is of common occurrence in the SHAN NAMA and elsewhere, does not admit the mark of the IZAFUT, and has been therefore assigned to the class of PARTICLES. It is employed in the sense of the word **فَرَوَن**. Example: **بَدِيدَارِوِي زِي سِيَهَامَان شَدَم** "I went to ISPANAUN to see him;" &c.

ب LIKE.

This word is probably a contracted form of the word **اَب** LIKE: as **بِشَل** or **اَب** "Like an elephant;" **بِشَل** "Like musk;" &c. Example: **چُونَه زَنْدَسَر بِشَل** "When she combs her hair black and fragrant as musk;" **بِشَل** "Let the breeze of KHOOTEN advance and steal odour;" (more delightful than its own.)

N. B. The word **س**, in the second line, is plainly the imperative of the verb **سَوَدَن** or **سَیْدَن** To RUB or To WEAR.

س

THIS is another form of the word **سَر**: as **سَرِکُون** for **سَرِکُون** "Inverted;" **سَرِکَسَر** for **سَرِکَسَر** "Light-headed;" **سَرِاَن** "The upper end;" as opposed to **پایان** "The lower end of any thing;" &c. Example:

بگوئید نشان بر زیر خشت رستم "Look into the graves under the tombs;" **که نشانی تو سر ایشان ز پایان** "And you will not be able to distinguish the head from the feet of those who are buried;" &c. The word **سَر** is also employed as a termination, in the sense of LIKE: as **سَرِیو** "Like a Demon;" **سَرِزیرک** "Like an intelligent man;" **سَرِک** "Like a dog in disposition;" **سَرِمار** "Like a snake;" an epithet applicable to the Persian king **قشاک**, from whose shoulders, touched by the Devil, grew two living snakes that could be fed only by the brains of children.

سان

THIS word is also employed as a termination in the sense of LIKE: as **سَیْران** "Like a lion;" **سَیْه سان** "Like a shadow;" **سَیْه سان** "Like a tulip;" **سَیْه سان** "Like one or the same thing;" **سَیْه سان** "Resembling each other;" &c. Example: **سَیْه سان داغ تو بردن روی در محرابم** "I shall go into the fields, my heart streaked like the tulip, with the impression of grief occasioned by the love which I bear to you;" &c.

شاه

THE word **شاه**, properly a KING, is commonly prefixed to other words in the sense of LARGE or EXCELLENT; being opposed

opposed, in this respect, to the word **خس**, which signifies **LARGE OR COARSE**, as already stated in treating of that word. Example: **ش. ر. ر. ش.** "A large road or highway;" **ش. ر. ن. ش.** "The large beams of a house;" **ش. ن. ن. ش.** "A large wind instrument of music;" **ش. س. س. ش.** "A large and excellent mulberry;" **ش. س. س. ش.** "A good horseman;" **ش. ب. ب. ش.** "Ambergris;" (because of its excellent odour;) &c. The word **ش.** is often contracted into **ش**: as **ر. ر.** is into **ر. ر**; **پ. پ.** into **پ. پ**; &c.

OTHER.

THE application of this word to the purposes of Speech, is very nearly the same with that of the Persian **جسن**, already noticed in PAGE 489 OF THIS VOLUME, to which the reader is therefore referred. Example: **جسنر آه کرم بود مشیج دل سوزی مرا** "I have no friend but only my sighs;" **جسنر** "And none to weep for me but my own eyes" The word **جسنر** must be followed by the **مُتَّ** **البت**, which is often omitted after **جسنر**: as **جسنر** **احدی و غبسی را دشمن نمی گزیم** "I consider no man as my enemy;" **جسنر** **فرمان غبیر است دوست نیست** "Such a man is a stranger not a friend;" &c. The word **جسنر** is generally followed by the mark of the **IZAFUT**, which is not true of the word **جسن**; but both may follow the particle **و**, and may be followed, themselves, by the particle **از**, which then supplies the place of the **IZAFUT**: as **جسنر ازین** **و جسنر از نام تو**; &c. Examples: **جسنر** **بش در پی آزار و مزاح خواهی کن** "Do evil to none, and in every thing else, follow the bent of your own inclination;" **جسنر** **یک در مشربعت ما جسنر ازین گف بی نیست** "For according to our principles, nothing is faulty but this alone." Generally speaking.

speaking, either of the words **فَسِير** or **فَجَسَر** may accurately supply the place of the other, in the common usage of the Persian Language.

تا

THIS is another form of the preposition **ت**, WITH, the first letter having suffered a permutation which is pretty common to the Language: as **زبان** for **زبان**.

"The tongue;" &c. Example: **جَسَادِ وی کَم پیر از خَصَّه بَسَد**,
 "The decrepit old juggler died in distress;"

رُویِ تَوِی زشت ناکِ سَرَد "And committed his vicious spirit to MAULIK;" (the name of the angel who has charge of Hell.) There are other examples of the same

nature: as **تا دَر گفتم** "I spoke with him;"

"I went away with him;" &c. Of the occurrence of **تا**, as another form of the word **وا**, the following example

may be adduced: **سَبَرَم دَار کُشَم نِشِیم نَه چُون مَکَس** "I shall dwell in retirement like the SEXMOORCH, and will not, like the fly, **بِشِیم** از جَرِیسی تَر جَا کَر مَارِ سَم alight wherever I go, from motives of avarice, or a greedy disposition."

I conceive the words **تا دَر گفتم** are here employed for **وا دَر گفتم**, or perhaps for **بَر گفتم**, which seems to be the opinion of the author of the SOOROOREZ.

تام و ام

THESE terminations, added to the end of certain substantive nouns, have the sense of **رَنگ** COLOR: as **شک تام** or **شک و ام** "Black as musk;" **نخل تام** "Red as the rose;" **مَرآتَجَمینِ چَسَدِ نخلِ تام بُوَد** "Blue;" &c. Example: **مَرآتَجَمینِ چَسَدِ نخلِ تام بُوَد** "I had then a face that might vie in color with the rose;" &c.

فرا

فرا

I HAVE little to say of this word, because I have no very clear conception of its nature. It seems to have occasionally the sense of **بر** and **دور**: as **وَأَمِنْ رِيشَةٍ جَوْشَنَارَ فَرَأَسِهِ يَتَّبِعُهُم** "I will place the lappet of mischief on my head as a turban;" **فَرَأَسَهُم** (دورهم) **كَرَدُم** "I collected them all together;" &c. As a noun, it has been said to convey occasionally the sense, *first*, of the words **فَوْق** or **بالا** ABOVE; or HIGH: as **يَقْتَضِي فَرَأْرَ حُجْبٍ لَمْ تَسُدْ** "He said, I can fly no higher;" *secondly*, of the words **بِش** BEFORE; or **نزدیک** NEAR: as **فَرَأَرْتِ وَتَكُنْتِ أَيْ عَجَبٌ كَيْفَ تَوَلَّيْتِ** "He advanced or approached, and said, O wonderful! can this be you?" *thirdly*, of the word **دور** FAR: as **فَرَأَرْتِ** "He went a great way;" and *finally*, of the words **همه** or **هم** ALL: as **مَالِ خُودِ را از زَیْدِ فَرَأَرِ كَرْتَم** "I took all my property out of the hands of ZYDE;" &c. It is also frequently employed as a PLEONASM: as **فَرَأَوْتُ شَيْدَن** "To conceal;" or "To cover;" &c.

فرو

WHEN significant, this word seems to have the sense of the word **زیر** UNDER; being directly opposed to the particle **بر**: as **هَر نَفْسٍ بِكَ فَرُوءِي رَوْ دَمِ حَيَاتِ اَمْت** "Every breath we inhale, adds length to our life;" **و چون بر می آید مفسر ذات** "And gives joy to the soul, when again exhaled;" &c. The word **فرو** is often a PLEONASM, before the infinitive and tenses of a Persian verb: as **فرو گوشتن** "To speak;" **فرو شنیدن** "To hear;" &c. &c.

نَشْر

THIS word, added to the end of certain nouns, has the sense of LIKE : as *نَشْر* " Like a King ;" *نَشْر* " Like a Lion ;" *نَشْر* " Like a snake ;" an epithet often applied to the Persian King *نَشْر*, of whom I have already had occasion to speak.

نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ IN SHORT ; OR IN SUBSTANCE.

THERE is little to be observed on the practical application of this word, or more properly of this phrase, to the purposes of Speech. It is generally employed as a sort of *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* (SEE PAGE 465 OF THIS VOLUME,) when the speaker, passing over details of inferior moment, is desirous at once to come to the point. Examples : *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* " My best friends did not venture to defend my character by stating the truth ;" *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* " And they forgot (or neglected) the duties imposed by their long established intimacy with me ;" *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* " In short, I was involved in difficulties of every kind ;" &c. In modern times the phrase *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* is often employed in the sense of *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* as : *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* A LITTLE : in answer to the question *نِیْ اِنْجَمَدَ* " Have you any skill in the Persian Language ?" &c.

نَکْ

THIS word is compounded of the Arabic particle (or letter) *نَکْ* THEN, and the word *نَکْ*, which signifies ENOUGH. Its occurrence in the Persian Language is chiefly or entirely restricted to the

the compositions of modern times. Example: **ترا می خواهم تقد**
 " I wish for you alone;" **و دیگر کسی را نمی دانم** " And have no-
 thing to do with any body else;" **ما را از خداوند تقد بر ذات خداست**
 " I have no dependence but on God alone;" &c.

کاش کاشکی کاشی کاشی

• WOULD IT WERE SO; OR WOULD IT MAY BE SO.

THESE are various forms of the same word; or perhaps **کاش** and **کاشکی** are compounded of **کاش** and **کاشی**, followed by the particle **که** THAT, which seems to have been anciently written **کی**. They indicate the wishes of the speaker; and are therefore followed by a given proposition, significant of the nature of such wishes. Now there is no limit to the wishes of the human mind, which are indifferently extended to past or future time, and to all imaginable objects, as well those which we hope to attain, as those which we know to be unattainable. Accordingly, the proposition following the word **کاش** and its synonymes, is often referable, *first*, to past time: as **مرا ای کاشکی مادر نمی زاد** " Would that my mother had never bore me;" **و اگر می زاد کس شیرم نمی داد** " Or that the nurse had never fed me with milk!" Or, *secondly*, it is referable to future time, but still significant of an object which we know to be unattainable: as **کاش زید کاری نمیبرد** " Would that ZYDE may never die;" &c. Or, *finally*, it is significant of an object which we believe or presume to be attainable: as **کاش بر سر خاک من افتد کاش در قفسه** " Grant Heaven! she may pass over my ashes on the day of reurrection;" **که چون از خاک برخیزم رانم دستم بدامنش** " That when I rise from the dust, I may touch her garment;" &c. (N. B. The poet does not hope for the attainment of so much happiness at any earlier period of time.) It is only necessary to add,

add, that we cannot accurately wish for that which we know to be of certain occurrence; whence it follows, that we never say "Would the sun may rise this morning!" because we know very well that the sun will rise.

No.

THIS Arabic word is pretty frequently employed in the Persian Language to answer, in the negative, a proposition expressed in the affirmative form. Example:
 گفتمت هیچ از نحو خواندی گفت لا Have you ever (said the Grammarian) learnt any syntax? "No!" (replied the Boy-man;)
 گفتمت بنیم عمر تو شد در فن گفت بنیم عمر تو شد در فن Then, (said the Grammarian,) half of your life has been passed in vain;" &c.

لیکن ولیکن و لیکن ولیکن BUT.

THESE are various forms of the word لیکن, or ولیکن, having the particle واو prefixed. The Persians have borrowed this word from the Arabs, by whom it is variously written وَلَکِنْ; وَلَکِنْ; وَلَکِنْ; وَلَکِنْ; And after LAUM, there is a broad ALIF uttered but not written, (or written generally above the line,) which has been converted by the Persians into YA MUJHOOL.

THE word لیکن is commonly employed to indicate the relation signified by the term ایشند راک, and has perhaps no real fluctuations of sense. The term ایشند راک literally signifies DISCOVERY; and, in its technical sense, it means "the removal, by one proposition, of a doubt engendered by the utterance of another." The two propositions are connected together by means of the word لیکن BUT; and they must

be

be somehow or other **OPPOSED** to each other in point of sense. The nature of this opposition is perhaps too various to admit of much illustration by the rules of Grammar, yet I am anxious to render it as clear as possible, and the examples detailed in the following rules may possibly serve to throw light on the subject.

R U L E F I R S T.

THE opposition of sense, between two propositions connected together by means of the word **بیشک** But, may consist in what has been termed **متناقض** and this happens, when the predicate of either proposition denotes the negation of the **SAME ATTRIBUTE**, which is applicable, in the affirmative, to the other proposition. In this case, the subject of both propositions cannot be the same. Examples:

زید آمد لیکن عمر نیامد "Zyde is come, but Amr is not come;"
 نه ند صایم سائی و نهک نایابد "HAUTIME TAUREZ lives no longer, but to all eternity without end;"

بماند نام بلندش به بگوئی مشهور "His name, celebrated for virtue, will continue to endure;" &c. Or, if the predicate of either proposition be directly opposed to that of the other in point of sense, they will be still connected by the word **بیشک**, because **FOOLY** is merely a negation of **WISDOM**, and **IGNORANCE** is merely a negation of **KNOWLEDGE**; &c. Example:

زید متحرک است لیکن عمر ساکن است "Zyde is moving, but Amr is at rest;" &c.

R U L E S E C O N D.

THE opposition of sense, between two propositions connected together by means of the word **بیشک** But, may consist in what has been termed **متضاد** and this happens, when the

the predicate of either proposition is significant of an attribute DIFFERENT from that signified by the other, but not absolutely of a contrary nature. In this case, the subject of both propositions may be the same; but if they happen to be so, the one will be affirmative, and the other negative. Example: "Zyde زید شجاع نیست لیکن سخی است" "Zyde is not brave, but he is liberal;" or, by transferring the negative to the second proposition, "Zyde is brave but he is not liberal;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

WHEN the predicate of either proposition happens to be significant of the same attribute, an opposition of sense may yet be obtained by having recourse to the DEGREES OF COMPARISON: as "Zyde زید ترا دوست می دارد" "Zyde is attached to you as a friend;" "But I تو بیشتر من ترا دوست تری دارم" "But I love you better than he does." Or to furnish the authority of the Poet FUKHREE: "مشتاقان بیدار تو آند اهل نظر نیست" "The admirers of beauty desire to behold you;" "But there are none از محرابی دل سوخته مشتاقان تری نیست" "who desire it more than FUKHREE;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

THE same predicate being applicable to either proposition, it may yet be so restricted in the second, by means of other words with which it is connected, as to create the necessary opposition of sense. Example: "صبح بر دود می کشم شکایت" "When the morning draws the curtain of light, I utter my complaints;" "But I utter توئی گم بر آن محسوس که غم ساز من است" "But I utter them to him only, who takes a share in my sorrows;" &c.

RULE

R U L E F I F T H.

THE opposition of sense between either proposition is not always expressed in terms, and must be inferred, in that case, by the understanding of the reader. Examples :

“ I thought it a pity to waste my instructions on brutes; ” *در بیخ آدم تر پست شتوران* “ And to hold up a mirror before the blind; ” *و آینه داری در محض کوران* “ But the door of my subject was open; ” *و این در متنی باز بود* “ And the chain of my reasoning was long; ” *و بسبب زنجیر دراز* that is to say, “ It led me on; ” &c. Supply the ellipsis: “ I thought it a pity to waste my instructions on brutes, and was therefore disposed to be silent, but I spoke notwithstanding, because the door of my subject was open; ” &c. *بسیاری گفتم که دل باکس نه میزدند ولی* “ I often determined never to fall in love; ” *و بدیدار خوبان اختیار از دست دانی برد* “ But beauty is not to be resisted by the power of wisdom. ” Supply the ellipsis: “ I had often determined never to fall in love, but my determination was of no avail, because the sight of beauty; ” &c. &c. *هرگز در سر نه بود اندیشه سودا و یب* “ The idea of falling in love never entered my mind; ” *پس اگر در بند می افتد منم می شود* “ But even an elephant must yield, if he be caught in the toils; ” &c. Supply the ellipsis: “ I had no thought of falling in love, but I fell in love notwithstanding; ” &c. &c. I shall not venture to multiply, farther, the examples of this nature, which the reader will be able to form for himself at pleasure.

R U L E S I X T H.

THE word *بسی* has been supposed, occasionally, to assume the character of a *قرب* or PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION;

tion; in which case, the following proposition forms an exception to that which precedes it. Examples: **همه کس آمده** "They are all come;" **و اینک زید نبامد** "But ZYDE is not come;" that is to say, "They are all come except ZYDE, who is not come;" **فان همه را بشنود. بگو** "She listens with approbation to every body;" **ولی به قصه من چون رسد خواب شود** "But she goes to sleep when it happens to be my turn to speak," &c.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

THE word **اینک** is supposed to be occasionally employed to indicate the relation of DETAIL; known in Grammar by the term **تفصیل**, and more commonly signified by the word **اما**. Example: **همه کس دوستند در روز و اینک دوست آن را دان** "Every man is a friend before your face, but consider him only as a friend;" **که یاد آر د ز تو چون روز کاری در میان افتد** "Who thinks of you though absent for a long space of time." It seems to me that the word **اینک** is here plainly employed to indicate the relation signified by the term **اینکه را که**; and I have therefore inserted this rule, merely with a view to express my own opinion of its fallacy. For an account of the relation signified by the term **تفصیل** or DETAIL, SEE PAGE 460 OF THIS VOLUME.

R U L E E I G H T H.

THE word **اینک** is employed, occasionally, in a sense nearly approaching to that of **تصویر** MORE ESPECIALLY; in which case, the proposition by which it is followed tends, not merely to confirm, but to add force and emphasis to the proposition comprised in the preceding sentence. Example:

زاد

تَشَايِدْ كِرْ خُوبَانِ بِهْ مُتَخَرَارُ وَند "It is unbecoming in beautiful women to walk into the fields;"
 فَهْمِ كَسْرِش نَاسَنْدُ وَهَر جَا رُوند "To know every body, and to go every where;"
 نِیْلَاتِ اَنْتِ رَقْمِ بِهْ مُتَخَرَارُ وَنَبَك "It is unseemly in them to go into the fields;"
 نِهْ اِنْصَاتِ بَاشْدِ كِرْ بِلِی مَارُ وَند "But it is quite intolerable that they should go unaccompanied by us;"
 (their lovers;) &c.

R U L E N I N T H.

It is sometimes employed, merely to corroborate the sense of the preceding sentence; and this happens, when the sense of the sentence by which it is followed, may be certainly inferred from that which precedes it. Example:—

زَیْدِ اَگَر مِی آمَد اَدْر اَخُو سَتَمِی کَرْدَم "If ZYDE had come, I would have satisfied him;"
 وَ لَیْسِنِ نَبَا مِجُ کَنَم "But he did not come, what then can I do?" It must be obvious to the reader, that the non-arrival of ZYDE is completely ascertained by the sentence preceding the word لَیْسِنِ; whence it follows that the sentence following that word (اَیْکِنِ نَبَا مِ) serves merely to confirm or corroborate the sense of the first.

C O N C L U S I O N.

MR. TOOKE states that the English word BUT, antiently written BOT, is the imperative of the Anglo Saxon verb BOTAN, To boot; that is, "To superadd; To supply; To substitute; To atone for; To compensate with; To make amends with; To add something more, in order to make up a deficiency in something else." Among these various meanings of the word BUT, I prefer that of COMPENSATION OR ATONEMENT; *first*, because it seems to me that the idea of ADDITION OR OF SUPERADDING is more accurately applicable to the sense of the word AND, than it is to the sense of

the word **BUT**; *secondly*, because that idea does not, in my opinion, account for the necessity of the **OPPOSITION** which I have stated to exist between two propositions connected together by the word **BUT**; and, *finally*, because that opposition is very well accounted for on the supposition that the word **BUT** indicates the relation of **COMPENSATION OR ATONEMENT**. Having premised these observations, which the reader will adopt or reject according to the dictates of his own judgment, I now proceed to offer a few general remarks on the nature of the **OPPOSITION** to which I have adverted.

THE most complete opposition of sense that can be imagined, is certainly that which exists between two attributes of a contrary nature; as **RICHES** and **POVERTY**; **LIFE** and **DEATH**; **SICKNESS** and **HEALTH**; **VIRTUE** and **VICE**; &c. Yet two propositions, comprising an attribute of either class, cannot, in the Persian Language, be accurately connected together by the word **لیکن**, which is generally at least, if not invariably, superceded in this case by the word **بل**. The phrase **زید سخنی است بلیکه بخیر است** "ZYDE is liberal, no, not liberal, but a miser;" is therefore perfectly accurate, according to the idiom of the Persian Language; and so, also, is the phrase **زید سخنی نیست بلیکه بخیر است** "ZYDE is not liberal but a miser;" for reasons obvious to those who have adverted to the true nature of the word **بل**. On the other hand, the phrase **زید سخنی است لیکن بخیر است** "ZYDE is liberal but he is a miser," is plainly absurd: *first*, because both propositions are here effective with regard to **ZYDE**; and, *secondly*, because it follows that we ascribe to him two opposite and inconsistent attributes, which cannot both exist in his mind. And though the phrase **زید سخنی نیست لیکن بخیر است** "ZYDE is not liberal but he is a miser," has not certainly any absurdity, the word **لیکن** is here

here inaccurate, and must be therefore superceded by the word **فَرَسْت**: *first*, because the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word **بَلَسْ** depends on the OPPOSITION to which I have before adverted; and, *secondly*, because that opposition has no existence in the example before us; since the negation of LIBERALITY is generally equivalent to the presence of AVARICE OR A MISERLY DISPOSITION, with which, therefore, it cannot be contrasted. But the word **فَرَسْت** must yield, in its turn, to the word **بَلَسْ**, in the phrase **زَيْدٌ سَخِيٌّ يَتَرْتِيبُ بَلَسْ بَلَسْ بِحَسْبِ مَمْنُونَةٍ** "ZYDE is not liberal, but neither is he a miser;" *first*, because the middle point between liberality and avarice may be very fairly contrasted with either extreme, which justifies the use of the word **بَلَسْ**; and, *secondly*, because there is not here the relation signified by the term **اِخْتِرَاب**, which is necessary to the accuracy of the word **فَرَسْت**.

QUITTING those attributes that are directly opposed to each other by sense, we are now to consider others in which the opposition consists, merely, in a difference of sense; and here it is important to observe that the GOOD OR AGREEABLE qualities of every object are opposed to those which are BAD OR DISAGREEABLE; and this kind of opposition is generally, perhaps indispensibly necessary to the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word **بَلَسْ**; or, in our Language, by the word BUT. Accordingly, we say of a man that "He is courageous but not generous; rich but not liberal;" &c. or of a woman that "She has great beauty but very little sense;" &c. though BEAUTY is here an attribute of person, whereas SENSE OR INTELLIGENCE applies to her mind. And, on the contrary, we seldom or never say of a man that "He is cowardly but not liberal; poor but not generous;" &c. or of a woman that "she is very ugly but a very great fool;" &c. because UGLINESS and FOOLY are equally

equally disagreeable in their own nature, whence it happens that the mind will not recognise between them, that opposition which is necessary to constitute the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word **BUT**.

BUT if, as it very often happens, we are led by any accidental association of ideas to form an expectation that **BEAUTY** and **FOLLY** will be found together; and that **SENSE** is likely to accompany in women the absence of **GRACE** or **PERSONAL CHARMS**, we may then say of a woman that "she is very handsome but exceedingly sensible; or very ugly but remarkably foolish;" &c. because the association to which I have here adverted, immediately *creates* that opposition between the attributes in question, which is necessary to constitute the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word **BUT**.

YET still, it must be admitted that the most natural association of ideas is that by which the **GOOD** or **AGREEABLE** qualities of every object are opposed to those which are **BAD** or **DISAGREEABLE**; and it happens accordingly, in our Language, that the word **AND** (not **BUT**) is commonly employed to establish the connexion between two attributes of the same class; and that **AND** is generally superseded by **BUT**, in the case of two attributes opposed to each other in the manner to which I have now adverted. Examples: "She is very handsome and very agreeable;" "She is very handsome but not agreeable." "She is very ugly and very disagreeable;" "She is very ugly but not disagreeable;" &c. And the violation of this natural association of ideas, though it may be sometimes observed to occur in the Language, according to the principle explained in the preceding paragraph, is commonly marked in express terms: as for Example: "She is very ugly, but with all her ugliness, a very great fool; &c." where the phrase "with all her ugliness," or "notwithstanding her ugliness," is clearly employed to indicate an opinion that

that UGLINESS is generally the concomitant of WISDOM, and by a necessary consequence opposed to FOLLY.

BUT if the SUBJECT of two propositions connected together by the word BUT, shall not be the same, the attributes may then be of the same class, or otherwise, according to the option of every speaker; *first*, because we may oppose the good or bad qualities of one object to those of another; as "ZYDE is learned but AMR is virtuous;" "ZYDE is ignorant but AMR is vicious;" &c. and *secondly*, because we may oppose the GOOD qualities of one object to those which are BAD or DISAGREEABLE in another; as "ZYDE is learned but AMR is ignorant," and other examples of the same nature.

THE preceding observations are intended to illustrate some of the principles on which the practical application of the word *بِسْ*, or of BUT occurring in the sense of *بِسْ*, seems to depend; but the word BUT is employed for many various purposes of Speech; and must, therefore, be variously translated by the words *آتا*; *بِسْ*; *بِسْ*; &c. according to the examples in which it is found to occur. Thus, it occurs twice in the following example: *first*, in the sense of *بِسْ*, to denote the relation signified by the term *استند راک*; and, *secondly*, in the sense of *بِسْ*, to denote the relation signified by the term *اضراب*. "You pray, but (*بِسْ*) it is not that God would convert you to the true religion; but (*بِسْ*) that he would confirm you in your own." And it occurs, I think in the sense of *آتا*, at the beginning of HORACE's Ode on the witch CANIDIA, (*At, ô Decorum, quicquid in cœlo regit &c.*) as translated into English by DOCTOR FRANCIS.

But Oh, ye Gods, whose awful sway
 Heaven, earth, and human kind obey,
 What can this hideous noise intend?
 On me, what ghastly looks they bend! &c.

I venture to believe, though I can offer no demonstrative proof of the fact, that the word **BUT**, and the Latin **AT**, are here employed, like the word **أَيْ**, to add force and efficacy to the following proposition; (" I pray you, Oh ye Gods, what is the meaning of this hideous noise?" &c.) and, in that case, there is at least one sense of the word **BUT**, which is not accounted for by Mr. TOOKE's etymology. But if we admit the accuracy of that etymology, it is still, in my opinion, the merest mockery to say that there is nothing more to be done on the subject; for the practical application of the word **BUT** unquestionably admits of the most useful illustrations, utterly independent of all etymology, and of a nature more satisfactory than that recondite science has ever yet been able to furnish. (SEE MR. LOCKE's opinion on the subject, as quoted in the **DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY**, VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 190; and if you have any turn for Grammatical research, reject his examples and substitute others wherever you please, but adopt his principle which is certainly accurate, and will guide you to the truth, notwithstanding Mr. TOOKE's opinion to the contrary.)

ان LIKE.

THIS is the contracted form of the participle **مانش**, derived from the verb **مانش** TO RESEMBLE. It is added to the end of certain substantive nouns, in the sense of LIKE: as **پروای باد قاصدا و زیرس** "Go, thou ZEPHYR, as my messenger, and kiss خاک و زکار آستان مانش the dust of her threshold

threshold which resembles the heavens;" &c. The word **آسمان** itself, has been supposed, by some Etymologists, to be compounded of **آس** A MILLSTONE, and **مان** LIKE; because the heavens revolve in the manner of a millstone. The word **مان** has other senses, for which the reader is referred to the Dictionary.

مان LIKE.

THIS word is derived from the former by adding **ایف**; and is, in truth, a **صفت مشبهة**, or simple adjective noun, having the sense of LIKE. Ex: **بدترای صفت آمد ابدان نیبغ ملک مانا** "You break the ranks of your enemies with that sword which resembles the heavens." The word **مان** is also very commonly employed as a **کلمه تاکید**, or WORD OF CORROBORATION; and in that character, is generally translated by the word CERTAINLY. Example: **آنانس که مرا بکشت باز آمد پیش** "Having put me to death, she has come to visit me;" **مانا که دوش بسوخت بر کشته خویش** "Surely her heart is touched with compassion for her victim!" It is plain, however, that the word **مانا**, in this and other similar examples, might be accurately translated by the word "Apparently;" and does not therefore suffer any real fluctuation of sense. It forms a component part of the word **مانا**, which is of common occurrence in the Language, and will be duly considered in its proper place.

مر

As a particle, this word has no sense, or at least none that I am acquainted with. It is often prefixed to words followed by the termination **را**; and seems, in that case, to be a mere pleonasm: as **مراد را گفتن** "I said to him;" &c. It has been supposed

supposed by some writers to occur occasionally in the sense of RESTRICTION. Example: *مَرَّ اَوْرَا اَنَسَ كَبْسِيَا وَ مَنِي* "To him alone (the DEITY) belongs almighty greatness and self-sufficiency;" that is to say, "the most entire independence on all other beings;" &c. The word "alone" is here introduced for the purpose of conveying to the reader an accurate idea of the meaning imputed to the word *مَرَّ* when it occurs in the sense of RESTRICTION; but though the attributes here imputed to the DEITY, are certainly applicable to him alone, I am of opinion that this restriction, in the example before us, is rather inferred on principles of reason, than positively expressed by the word *مَرَّ*. In all the examples which have occurred to my observation of the practical application of the word *مَرَّ*, it is followed by a noun which is followed by *اَوْرَا* as *مَرَّ اَوْرَا اَنَسَ كَبْسِيَا وَ مَنِي* &c. but the Persian Grammarians seem to believe that its accuracy has no dependence on the use of *اَوْرَا*, and in this opinion they are probably right.

مَرَّ EXCEPT; PERHAPS; &c.

THOSE who believe that *مَرَّ* is a corruption of the verb *گِزَر* TAKE, will be disposed, I imagine, to consider *مَرَّ* as a corruption of the verb *نِگِزَر* DO NOT TAKE, in the Prohibitive form. Be that as it may, the word *مَرَّ* is generally considered as a *حَرْفِ اِسْتِثْنَا* OF PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION; and, in that character, it is commonly employed to form, *first*, the *اِسْتِثْنَايِ مَخْتَصَص* OF PROPER EXCEPTION; and, *secondly*, the *اِسْتِثْنَايِ مُنْقَطِع* OF IMPROPER EXCEPTION.

THE PROPER EXCEPTION is that in which the *مُسْتَثْنَا* OF THING EXCEPTED, is known to have been originally comprised in the sense of the *مُسْتَثْنَايِ مَشْتَق* from which it is excepted:

cepted: as **همه کس آمدند مگر زید** "They are all come but ZYDE;" where the words **همه کس** form the **مستثنای مبني**, as opposed to **زید** who is the **مستثنی**, properly excepted by means of the word **مگر**; because the phrase **همه کس آمدند** would have been otherwise understood as applicable to ZYDE among others. It follows from the nature of the **مستثنی**, that the **مستثنای مبني** must be applicable to a PLURALITY of objects; which may be obtained, *first*, by the use of numerals, or of the plural numbers; as **همه علماء شهر آمدند مگر زید** "The learned men of the city are all come but ZYDE;" *secondly*, by the use of a collective noun: as **همه کاروان رسیدند مگر زید** "The caravan are all arrived but ZYDE;" and, *finally*, by the use of a negative applicable to a noun in the singular number: as **کس نیامد مگر زید** "Nobody is come but ZYDE;" because the phrase "No body is come;" or "Not any body is come," is equivalent to an affirmation of the absence of every body. The **مستثنای مبني** which is expressed in the preceding examples, may be accurately understood in many others: as **نزد من نیامد مگر زید** "No body came to me but ZYDE;" or to furnish the authority of SAADEE: **اگر گنج دار دنیاست آوری** "Though you possess yourself of the treasures of KAAROON," **نماند مگر آنچه بخوشی بری** "They will not remain; but what you bellow (in charity, &c.) that you will carry with you" (to the next world.) Or to express the same sentiment in other words: "No part of your treasures will avail you in the next world, but that part which is here devoted to charitable uses."

THE preceding observations are applicable to the **مستثنای مبني** OR PROPER EXCEPTION; to which the

اِسْتِثْنَائِي or IMPROPER EXCEPTION is directly opposed. The latter, therefore, extends to all those examples in which the **مُشْتَنْقِی** is known not to be included in the **مُشْتَنْقِی** : as **بَجَعَتِ مَدْرَسَهُ أَهْلَهُ مگر زَیْد** "The people of the College are all arrived but ZYDE;" when it so happens that ZYDE, though expected in the College, is known not to be a member of that institution. So also in the following Example: **چهار صد کُتَمِ آنْد از تَلَبِ کُردند** "Four hundred accomplished archers missed the mark; **مگر کُودکی** except a child, **یکه بر بامِ رِیاضی** who on the top of a building, **بِسَازِ چَهِزَرِ اَزِ هَرِ طَرَفِ می آنْداخت** was shooting arrows for his amusement in every direction: **بادِ سَب** The morning breeze **زِیرِ اَوِ اَوَرِ طَلَقِ اَنگِشْتَرِی بِکُذَرِ اَنبَد** carried his arrow straight through the ring;" &c. Since it must be obvious to the reader, that the child is here improperly excepted from the four hundred archers, because he did not originally constitute one of their number. Such improper exceptions are of common occurrence in the Persian Language, but not perhaps in every other Tongue.

I WILL not undertake to affirm that the word **مگر** has any real fluctuations of sense, but the practical application of that word to the purposes of Speech, demands the illustrations comprised in the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

THE word **مگر** is employed as a **حَرْفِ اِسْتِثْنَائِي** or PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION, in the manner stated in the preceding observations. Example: **اُمیدِ بَشَدِ مَشِکِنِ بَرِ سَبِ و اِنِ نِیست** "The hopes of this poor and forlorn mortal depend on nothing;"

nothing;" مگر به لطف خداوند بزرگوار نباشد. "Except on the bounty of God, the general benefactor of all his creatures." This is an example of the **PROPER EXCEPTION**.
 "Ordinary physicians علاج در دُمَشَماتان طبیب مام نشاند know not how to cure the pangs inflicted by Love on his votaries;" "Except **LYLEE**, who alone knows how to cure the woes of the love-lorn **MUJNOON**." This is intended as an example of the **IMPROPER EXCEPTION**, but its true nature perhaps admits of some discussion.

R U L E S E C O N D .

THE word **مَکَر** is commonly employed to denote the relation of **DOUBTFUL EXPECTATION**, known by the terms **مَکَر** و **اِشْتِاق**. In this case, it is generally translated by the word **PERHAPS**; and the examples of its occurrence are generally divided into those which indicate, *first* **اِشْتِاق** or **HOPE**: as **اِشْتِاقِ مَکَرِ نَاصِحِی** "Perhaps you will admonish (or I hope you will admonish) these people;" &c. *secondly*, **اِشْتِاق** or **FEAR**: as **اِشْتِاقِ مَکَرِ رَاقِی** "You are going to leave me, perhaps you will forget me; or I fear you will forget me;" &c. and, *finally*, **اِشْتِاقِ مَکَرِ شَکِّ** **DOUBT** or **SUSPICION**: as **اِشْتِاقِ مَکَرِ شَکِّ** "Perhaps she has forgotten my ancient services;" a sentiment, however, which implies **FEAR**; though other examples might no doubt be found, in which there is no mixture either of **HOPE** or **FEAR**.

R U L E

R U L E T H I R D.

ALL the remaining examples of the practical application of the word **مگر** may be referred, I imagine, to one or other of the senses detailed in the preceding rules; and it is possible, even, that one of those senses may be referred to the other; in which case, the word **مگر** has no real fluctuations of sense. Be that as it may, I proceed to state that the word **مگر** is supposed to denote, occasionally, the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term **تَبَاقُص**; or more properly, in my opinion, it denotes that particular species of CAUSATION which is known by the terms **غایت و غرض**, and more commonly signified by the particle **تا**. Example: **حلال است از و قتل کردن مگر** "It is lawful to disclose his designs; (the designs of a tyrant;)" **مگر سخن باشد از و برسد** "that mankind may be on their guard against him."

R U L E F O U R T H.

It is occasionally employed to denote the relation signified by the term **افتراب**, and more commonly expressed by the word **بَل**. Example: **دیدم کسی سرگمان از شراب** "I saw no man intoxicated with wine;" **مگر نم خرابات دیدم خراب** "Nay, I even saw the tavern deserted." It may be also annexed to an INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE; in which case it is generally understood to have itself an Interrogative sense like the particle **آیا**. Example: **خواب است مگر کرمی نماید** "Is this a dream which appears to me?" **ما عشوه نمی دیدم خب نم** "Or does my imagination deceive me?" &c. There is no doubt of the interrogative character of this sentence, but the word **مگر** might certainly be translated by the word **PERHAPS**.

R U L E

RULE FIFTH.

It is supposed to be occasionally employed to indicate the relation of **DISCOVERY**; known in Grammar by the term

استدراک, and more commonly signified by the word

Example: "I have heard" شنیده ام که ازینب مروی قسبر: لبیک.

that against a pious Durveish, "دول آرزو شد باو شای کسبر"

"A powerful monarch conceived relentment;"

"But the Durveish had merely" "نمگز بر زبانش حتی رفته بود"

spoken the truth;" "ز کز و ن کشی بروی آشفته بود"

And the offence taken by the king was founded on the haughtiness of his own character."

I am clearly of opinion that the word

نمگز cannot be accurately translated, in this example, by the

word **PERHAPS**. "Perhaps the Durveish had told him some

unpleasant truth;" because every man who understands the

Persian Language, will be of opinion, I believe, that the nar-

rator (SAADEH,) does not here state the fact as a mere guess of

his own, but as a matter of certainty. I am not equally sure

that the word نمگز is here employed in the sense of لبیک, and

will therefore leave the true meaning of that word, as it occurs

in the example before us, to be determined by the judgment

of every reader.

RULE SIXTH.

It is supposed to be occasionally employed in the sense of the

conjunctive **AND**. Example: سه صد و شصت و شصت فایر دانستی

"He understood three hundred and sixty rules;" (for wrest-

ling.) "و هر روز از آن نوعی گر فستی"

every day;" "مگر گوشه خاطرش با جمال یکی از شاگردان میب داشت"

"But he conceived an affection for one of his pupils;"

"سه صد و پنجاه و نه بندش در آن وقت"

And taught him

three hundred and fifty-nine rules;" &c. I have here translated the word **مگر** by the word **BUT**; yet it does not seem to denote the relation signified by the term **استندراک**, since the first proposition does not, apparently, give birth to a doubt which is removed by the second. Whether it has or has not the sense of the conjunctive **AND**, I leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader.

R U L E S E V E N T H.

It is supposed to be occasionally employed after **اِنَّ**, as a **كَلِمَةُ تَاكِيدٍ**, OR WORD OF CORROBORATION; but the examples adduced in proof of that opinion, are utterly unsatisfactory in my estimation. Example: **مَنْزِلُكَ نَفْسٌ يَوْمِي نُوَا آوَدِيمُ مَسِيرٍ** "In order that the morning breeze might waft to me a gale charged with fragrance from thee;"
اِنَّ شَبَّ شَتِيرٍ مَرِغٍ مَسْتَعْرِضٍ اَنْ يَوْمٍ "I watched all night to hear the crowing of the early cock;" &c. It is plain, I think, that the word **مگر** might be here translated by the word **PERHAPS**; in which case, it is not employed as a **كَلِمَةُ تَاكِيدٍ** to corroborate the sense of the particle **اِنَّ**.

C O N C L U S I O N.

I HAVE nothing more to observe on the nature and application of the word **مگر** to the purposes of Speech; and am not much satisfied with the accuracy of the ideas which, in the absence of better information, I have yet thought it right to throw out on the subject. The examples furnished by me, constitute the facts, with reference to which, our opinion of the true meaning of the word **مگر** must be ultimately formed; but whether I have mistaken its meaning in any one or more of these examples, or whether it has, or has not any real fluctuations

tuations of sense, these are questions of theory, which are to be determined by the judgment of every reader. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of the word **نہ**.

THE word **نہ** is a negative corresponding with **نہ**, from which it has been formed in all probability, since the letters **نہ** and **نہ** are often convertible together in the Language: as **نہ** or **نہ** "The armour of a man or a horse," &c. Example: **نہ** "He imitates the conduct of his own Imaum," **نہ** "But do you have no confidence, either in him, or in his Imaum." These lines are translated by guess, since I know nothing of the context with which they are connected. So, also, in the following example: **نہ** **نہ** which occurs in the sense of **نہ** "Neither does this remain nor does that," &c. Except in the second persons singular and plural of the Prohibitive mode of a Persian verb, the word **نہ** is generally superseded in the Language by **نہ**.

THIS word, prefixed to an adjective noun or an epithet, is employed to indicate the relation of NEGATION: as **نہ** UNWISE; **نہ** UNHEARD; **نہ** NOT TO BE FOUND; **نہ** UNWORTHY; &c. &c. It is rarely prefixed to substantive nouns, though some examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language: as **نہ** UNEVEN; **نہ** UNTHINKING; or "Having no resource," &c. It is opposed in point of sense to the word **نہ** WITHOUT, which is employed to indicate the relation of PRIVATION.

THIS is the letter نون, the nature of which has already been explained in PAGE 411 ET SEQ. OF THIS VOLUME. In poetry, it is sometimes pronounced with نون مظهر, like the word زَر, to which it rhymes in the poem from which I have extracted the following example :
 زَبَان رَا دَرَان رُحَصِتْ زَبِدِه
 " Permit your tongue to prohibit that ; " &c.

THIS is another negative, synonymous with نِه ; and there is nothing to be observed on the subject of its application to the purposes of speech. The following is an example of its occurrence in the Language :
 نِي نَابِ وَفِضِ دَارَمِ نِي عَاقِبَتِ بَدَارِي
 " Neither can I bear your presence, nor suffer your absence." Some writers believe the letter نون of the word نِي to be moveable by the vowel *Futha*, and others give the preference to the vowel *Kufra*, in which case the letter *Ya* assumes the sound of *Ya Mujhool*. It may be inferred from a Commentary of JAUMEZ on the opening of the MUSNOVEE of M. LOVER ROOM, that he gave the preference to the vowel *Futha*; but his observations on the subject would occupy more space than can be reasonably assigned to such a discussion.

نِسْبَتِ ALSO.

THIS word is indifferently employed, *first*, to indicate " the participation of two nouns in the same action : " as زَبِدِه آمَدَ وَبُكَرَ نِسْبَتِ " ZYDE is come and so also is BUKR ; " *secondly*, to indicate " the participation of two actions in the same noun : " as زَبِدِه بَرِ بَرِ خَشَمِ كَرِنَتَ وَنِسْبَتِ دُشْنَا مَشِ دَا د " ZYDE became angry with BUKR, and also abused him ; " or, *finally*,

to indicate "the participation of two actions in the same inference:" as *زید نیامد و بکر نیز رفت* "ZYDE is not come, and BUKR also is gone;" where the absence both of ZYDE and BUKR, is obviously inferred from either of the verbs with which they are here connected.

It follows from the preceding observations, that the word *نیز* invariably requires two sentences, both of which may be expressed in terms: as *دل رقت و سینه نیز خالی شد ز جان گزین* "My heart is gone, and my bosom, also, is now alas! emptied of my soul," *ای صبر باز گرد که این جاسه جای نیست* "Leave me therefore, O patience! for here is no residence for you;" &c. Or one of them may be accurately omitted in speech, provided the context be of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission. Example: *چون در محراب آن خوشبخت خودم بختیایی* "Devoted to the love of my mistress who resembles the sun, I am so accustomed to solitude;"

که اگر دوستم دید از سایه خود نیز بگریزم "That were it possible, I would fly *EVEN* (literally, *ALSO*,) from my own shadow." Supply the ellipsis: "As I fly from others, so also would I fly from my own shadow;" &c. Of the repetition of *نیز* in either proposition, the following example may be adduced: *نه زوایم اینسان که باشند نیز* "Neither do those who live escape the shafts of woe;"

نه آنان که رفتند رستند نیز "Nor have those escaped them who are already dead." (The Poet, I conceive, means that "The dead have not yet escaped, since the great day of judgment is still before them.") The same sentiment is expressed more clearly and forcibly, in the following couplet, from the Hindoostanee Poet *Souda*:

همان فکر نیستی و مانده فکر خشن "Here, (in this world,) are

are the cares of life; and there, (in the next world,) are the terrors of judgment;" **اَسْوَدِيْ خُسْرِيْ سَتَ نَبَهَانِ مَيْ نَهْ وَنَانِ مَيْ**
 " Tranquillity is therefore nothing but a name, and is equally unattainable here and hereafter."

THE words **نِسْبَر** and **نَم** are sometimes employed as synonymous terms; and in that case, the one may follow the other, in order to corroborate or enforce its meaning. Example: **اِغْنَادِيْ يَنْتَ بَرِ كَارِ مَسَن** " There is no dependence on the affairs of this world;" **بَلَكِهْ بَرِ تَرْدُوْنِ تَرْدَانِ نِسْبَرِ نَم**
 " Nay, nor even on the revolving Heavens." The word **نِسْبَر** has no real fluctuations of sense, though the Persian Grammarians (erroneously I think,) have assigned to it the sense of the preposition **بِ** in the example **جَوَابِيْ بِمَرْغَبِيْ نِسْبَرِ نَم**
 " Carry with you my answer and also my services;" &c.

وَا

THIS word occurs in the sense of **بِ** WITH, of which it is probably another form; as **اَو** is another form of **اَوَاب**; **اَو** of **اَب**; &c. Example: **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** for **بَاوْغَنْتَم** " I said to him;" or "spoke with him;" &c. It is also supposed to occur occasionally in the sense of the particle **بِهْ**: as **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " Although we are going to a place of refuge." (**اَوَاوْغَنْتَم**) Prefixed to a Persian Infinitive, it is sometimes significant: as **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " To open the door;" and sometimes a pleonasm: as **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " To arrive;" **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " To escape;" &c.

وَاو

As a termination, this word has the sense of **LIKE**: as **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " Like a master;" **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم** " Like a servant;" **اَوَاوْغَنْتَم**

فَلَمْ وَار "Like a pen;" تَمَرَّار "Like each other," or
 "Even;" &c. Example: بَاوَزْ كَنَمِ اَنْگَتِ نَسَمِ وَاَرِشَكْتِ
 "May my fingers be cut from my hand like a pen." It seems
 also to possess, occasionally, the sense of the word صَاحِب
 as اَشْبُوَار "A man of understanding;" or "A wise man;"
 وَاَرِشَكْتِ "A sentinel;" &c.

وَان

As a termination, this word generally signifies A PROTECTOR; GUARDIAN; &c. as تَگِه وَاَن "A keeper of sheep;"
 سَار وَاَن "One who takes care of the fields;" وَشَت وَاَن
 "The groom of a camel;" &c. It is entirely synonymous
 with بَان, from which it is formed in all probability, by the
 usual conversion of بَا into وَاو. The word بَان is, how-
 ever, more commonly used in the Language than وَاَن: as
 دَر بَان "A door keeper;" &c. And though both are now
 employed as terminations, they may have been originally
 self significant words.

وَشش

As a termination, this word is commonly employed, like
 the word فَشش, in the sense of LIKE: as مَآوَشش "Like the
 moon;" خُور وَشش "Like the sun;" &c. And it is pro-
 bable that they are both varieties of the same word, though
 فَشش occurs in the Language more commonly than وَشش.
 Example: بَشْتَبَشْتَب وَقَرَّ خَان قَرُّ وِدَار اَرَايِ آدَشش فَشش
 "Having the grace of PISHUNÖ; the dignity of KUDÜR KHAN;
 the wisdom of DARIUS; the skill (in archery) of the celebra-
 ted AURUSH;" مَبَاوَشش وَشش مَوِيد بَدِشْتَشْتَش مَن مَقَرَّ
 "In glory equal to SEZAWUSH; in rank equal to MOOZUFFUR;
 having a body strong as that of ROOSTÖM; and a hand fa-
 vored by Divine Providence;" &c.

, STRANGE! &c.

THE word , is always an INTERJECTION, and has not, perhaps, any real fluctuations of sense. Its practical application to the purposes of speech is nevertheless susceptible, in my opinion, of some illustrations; and these I proceed to furnish accordingly, in the form of detached and general rules.

RULE FIRST.

It is commonly employed to indicate SURPRISE OR ASTONISHMENT: in which case, it is generally followed by an Interrogative sentence significant of the cause of such astonishment, whether accompanied by sensations of a painful or a pleasurable nature. Examples: "وہ چه صبت دی کہ ہر صبتی کہ از زخم تو بمانست" "Heavens what an admirable huntress are you! whose wounded victim continues to pursue" سر بد بمان تو دار و ندار تو د جان در تنفس you during the rest of his life." It is proper to observe that the word از here denotes the relation specified in RULE FIRST, PAGE 435 OF THIS VOLUME: whence it follows that the word زخم, in the first line, has in reality the sense of the Plural number: "Every victim which has received of your wounds;" &c. The Poet's mistress is obviously the huntress of whom he speaks on the present occasion, and the wounds inflicted, are those of Love. The sentiment excited, is that of ADMIRATION, which is converted into CENSURE, in the following example: "بدر و مادر و فرزند و عزیزان رفتند" "Our parents and children and all whom we love are gone!" "وہ چه غافل و مستقیم: چو گوشت نظر نیم" "Heavens! then, how negligent, unreflecting and short sighted are we!"

R U L E S E C O N D.

It is sometimes followed by a sentence significant of a proposition, the occurrence of which we desire to prevent; and has been supposed, in this case, to denote an idea nearly synonymous with that signified by the word **مَا لَيْتَ** **LET IT NEVER BE**. Example: **وَهَكَذَا مَا تَشْرَحُ أَتَكْبِرُ بِمُوتِ مَنْ مِثْلِي** "Heavens! Why should they punish her for the death of such a creature as I am?" &c. It is plain, however, that the word **مَا** is here rhetorically employed to form the **وَأَسْتَنْهَاهُمْ مِنَ الْكَافِرِي** as explained in PAGE 114 OF THIS VOLUME; and the word **وَهَكَذَا** has not, therefore, any real fluctuation of sense. The nominative to the word **يَكْبِرُ** is indefinite: "Why should ANY ONE punish her;" &c.

R U L E T H I R D.

It is sometimes followed by a sentence significant of our HOPES OR WISHES; and has been supposed, in that case, to indicate the idea signified by the terms **نَحْنُ وَنَحْنِي**: though in point of fact it has not, I believe, any real fluctuation of sense.

Examples: **مَا زِلْتُ أَسْمَعُ بِمَنْ أَوَّازِ سَبَابِ نَوْسِي** "In order that I might sometimes obtain intelligence of you;"

وَهَكَذَا مَا تَشْرَحُ أَتَكْبِرُ بِمُوتِ مَنْ مِثْلِي "Would that my abode (or, literally, "Heavens! how delightful if my abode) were on the road that leads to your habitation."

مَا زِلْتُ أَسْمَعُ بِمَنْ أَوَّازِ سَبَابِ نَوْسِي "I am always uttering her name, would that she would sometimes condescend to utter mine;" &c.

R U L E F O U R T H.

It is sometimes followed by a sentence significant of an event which is the subject of GRIEF, LAMENTATION OR REGRET:

and must be generally translated, in this case, by the word ALAS! Example: "I was pleased in the hope that I might die by the hand of my mistress;" (by the influence of her presence) **وَهْ كِه اِيْمِرَانِ يَشْسِ دَسْتِي كَرْدَه زَارَمِ بِي شَمْد** "But ALAS! absence from her is undermining my life."

R U L E F I F T H.

It is sometimes followed by a sentence significant of an evil already past, and therefore a subject of JOY and GRATULATION. Example: **آئِمْدِي وَهْ كِه بِرِ شَفَانِي بِرِ بَرِ تَشَانِ بُوْدَم** "You are come! Heavens how impatient, how sorrowful was I;" **نَا بِرِ فِئْسِي زِ بَرِ مِ صَوَرِ يَتِ بِي جَانِ بُوْدَم** "Since you left me, I have been merely the lifeless image of a man." It is also supposed to be employed occasionally in the sense of **وَهْ** Ho! HAVE A CARE! Example: **چَشْدِ بَنَازِ رَفْتَنَتِ وَهْ كِه مَهْا وَ نَا گُوسَانِ** "How long will your cruelty incite you to leave me? Have a care lest it happen (which Heaven forbid) **شَمْدِ بَدَا مَنَتِ زَنَدَ نَا لِهْ صَبَحِ شَاهِ مَسِينِ** that my sighs in the morning may set fire to your garment;" that is to say, "call down on your head the displeasure of heaven."

C O N C L U S I O N.

ADMITTING that the word **وَهْ** has no real fluctuations of sense, I hope the reader will not, at this period of his progress, require an explanation of the motives which have induced me to offer the preceding observations on its practical use. For the practical use of the word **وَهْ**, like that of other words, depends, not merely on the sense which it was formed to denote, but also on the idiom of the Language to which it belongs; and if the observations detailed in the preceding rules, have any tendency to illustrate the influence of Persian idiom,

idiom, as applicable to the practice application of that word, it is plain that they need no farther defence. With these remarks, I leave my readers to the exercise of their own judgment on the question that relates to the propriety or otherwise of inserting those rules; to which, to say the truth, I myself attach no very considerable degree of importance.

ت

THIS word, in its common application, is generally supposed to be nearly synonymous with اَيْت; a diminutive formed from the demonstrative اَيْن, and commonly employed in the sense of BEHOLD! I am of opinion, however, that the word ت has in it something of the character of a كَلِمَةُ تَنْبِيْهِ or WORD OF ADMONITION; whereas اَيْت is merely a DEMONSTRATIVE NOUN. Example: كَتَبَ بِرُكْنِ يَاقُوتِ الْاَسْوَدِ وَزُزْمِ "What should you make of the KABA, (or temple of Mecca,) its black stone, and the well ZUMZUM;

ت عَارِضَ وَزُتْفَ وَخِطْرَ كَانِ خَاصِي "Behold, rather, the face and the locks and the features of your beloved;" &c. There is an Arabic word ت, which is commonly employed as a كَلِمَةُ تَنْبِيْهِ or WORD OF ADMONITION; and also in the sense of the verb تَكْبَرُ TAKE. It is possible, therefore, that the Persian ت, which is of rare occurrence in the Language, may have been derived from that source.

ن

THIS is a كَلِمَةُ تَنْبِيْهِ or WORD OF ADMONITION; and may be generally, perhaps invariably, translated by the words Ho! HAVE A CARE! Its effect is to add force and emphasis to every proposition by which it is followed: as

ن شُكُوْتِمْ جُوْنِ وَاَقْبِ نِ اَز سِرِّ غَيْبِ "Have a care! do not despair, since you know nothing of the secrets of fortune;"

tune;" &c. and it is sometimes repeated by way of **HYPER-bole**: as **تَنْ وَ تَانْ اُورِ اَمُجُو دُرِ تَغْسِنَانْ** "Have a care! do not look for him in the garden." In the following example, it is supposed to have a sense nearly approaching to that of **TRULY**: **نَه پِنْد اَرَمَت مَالِ خُردُم تُو رِمِي** "I do not suppose that you make away with the property of other men;" **چِه پيش اَدَت نَابَرَنْدَانِ دَوِي** "What then has happened that I find you in jail!" **تَنْفَت كِرِيَانِ اِي مُبَارَك نَفَس** "To this, he replied, truly my good friend," **خُردُم بِحَبَابَتِ گِرِي مَالِ كَس** "I have not obtained by treachery the property of any body;" &c.

CERTAINLY.

THIS word is probably compounded of **EVERY**, and **مَدَّة**, formed from **آيَد**, which signifies **زَوْش**; that is to say, **MODE**; **MANNER**; &c. It is employed to corroborate the sense of every sentence to which it is annexed: as **مَدَّةً زَيْدٌ نَجِيبٌ اَنْتَ** "Certainly ZYDE is good or virtuous;" and is sometimes contracted in poetry into **مَدَّةً** or **مَدَّةً**. Its nature and character is too obvious to admit of illustration by the rules of Grammar.



THIS word seems properly to signify "Every time;" or "All times;" whence the adjective **ہرگز** ETERNAL. Example: **ہرچہ او پرودہ ہرگز ی نہا شد** "That which passes is not eternal;" **او ہرگز ی وباقی روانست** "God is eternal, and every thing is transitory but him alone." The word **ہرگز** should be compounded, apparently, of **ہر** EVERY, and some

some other word; but I know of no such word as *گر* in the Language, and cannot, therefore, explain its etymology. It is employed to corroborate the sense of a negative sentence; and, in combination with the negative, is constantly translated by the word NEVER. Example:

بمان آمدیم از قفسه هستی کاشکی هرگز
 "My soul is sick of the bonds of existence;"
 "Would that I had never entered this habitation of woe!" &c. It may accurately coalesce with an Interrogative sentence, of the nature signified by the term
 "هرگز دیدی دست دغایی بر کف بسته؟" as: *استنبهام انکاری* Did you ever see the hands of crime (here used for criminal,) bound to its shoulders? *یا نه بعلت دزدیشی* unless the first cause of it were poverty!" And the reason is obvious: *استنبهام انکاری* implies a negative, since the sense of the sentence might be thus expressed: "You NEVER saw a crime committed that was not originally occasioned by poverty;" &c. The existence of a negative, whether expressed or implied, is therefore necessary to the accuracy of the application of the word *گر*, which is never found to coalesce with any affirmative sentence whatever. It is indifferently applicable to all the tenses of a Persian verb; and, with the exception of its restriction to the negative and prohibitive forms, has nothing in its nature to require explanation.

Ho! *هوا*

THIS is probably another form of the word *او*, since the letters *ه* and *و* are not unfrequently permuted together. Example: *هوا را بکش و گویا با هر کشید* "Ho! Draw forth your swords and iron maces;" *و بسترهای چینی بستر در کشید* "And

cover your heads with shields of China;" &c. There is something to be observed on its nature and application to the purposes of Speech.

ثَمَّ

I AM of opinion that this word properly signifies **مُشَارِك**. A CO-PARTNER; or **شَرِيكَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ** "Participating with each other, in the sense of the following substantive noun," which is governed by it in the genitive case, though without the intervention of the vowel **مَ : مَرَدٌ** as **مَرَدٌ : مَرَدٌ** "Participating in pain;" **مَرَدٌ : مَرَدٌ** "Participating in the road;" or "A fellow traveller;" **مَرَدٌ : مَرَدٌ** "Participating in the same house;" or "A chum;" &c. Example: **وَلَا يَمُوتُ فِي الْبَيْتِ رُفَاةٌ تَنْتَبِهُ لَوْنِهَا** "There is not in the garden a tulip that rivals the color of your complexion;" &c. The examples of this class are very numerous, and may be formed by analogy, according to the pleasure of every reader, with little regard to the authority of prescription, which is not, however, to be entirely neglected.

BUT the word **ثَمَّ** may be also employed in the sense of **بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ** EACH OTHER; in which case, it seems to me that the idea signified by the word **شَرِيكَ** has been rejected by that operation of the mind which is known in Grammar by the term **تَجَنُّبٌ**, as already explained in PAGE 297 OF THIS VOLUME. In this case, the word **ثَمَّ** may follow a preposition: as **بِثَمَّ** "With each other;" **أَوْ ثَمَّ** "From each other;" **فِي ثَمَّ** "In each other;" **عَلَى ثَمَّ** "On each other;" &c. or it may precede or follow another noun by which it is governed in the genitive case: as **ثَمَّ شَرِيكَ** or **شَرِيكَ ثَمَّ** "A co-partner;" **ثَمَّ شَرِيكَ** or **شَرِيكَ ثَمَّ**

PARTICIPATION, is also very commonly employed in the sense of **نِسْبَت** Also; the nature of which has already been explained in PAGE 548 OF THIS VOLUME. And in this case, there are always two sentences either expressed or understood by the reader; as for example:

“ Since the period of enjoyment or intercourse with my beloved has passed away, I hope that of absence also may come to an end.” Here, both sentences are fully expressed, and the word **نَم** is given to the last; but it may yet be accurately given to both: as **نَم نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ** “ The balance corrects the balance;” **نَم نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ وَرَا نَزَادُ** “ And the balance also shews the deficiency of the balance.” In the case of the omission of one sentence, it must be supplied by the understanding of the reader: as **اَي دِلِ از شامِ بَرَانِ وَرُو زِيَا بَرَانِ نَم مَخُوَر** “ Be not grieved, O my soul! at the period of absence from your beloved;” **شامِ بَرَانِ نَم رَسَدِ رُو زِيَا بَرَانِ نَم مَخُوَر** “ For the night of separation will also, sooner or later come to an end;” that is to say, “ As the days of enjoyment passed away, so, also, will the nights of separation come to an end.”

The word **نَم**, followed by the demonstrative nouns, as **نَمَانِ** and **نَمَانِ**, seems to imply the sense signified by the term **تَقَرُّر** RESTRICTION, as already explained. Example: **بُنْدَه نَمَانِ يَدِ كَزِ تَقْوِيَّتِ مَرِ خُوشِ** “ He alone is a good servant of God, who on account of his sins, **عُذْرِ يَدِ كَزِ خُوشِ رَا آوَرَد**, offers up supplications at the throne of God;” &c. I think it possible, however, that the word **نَم** is even here employed in the sense of **نِسْبَت** Also; in which case, there ought to be two sentences, one of which not being expressed, must be supplied

plied by the understanding of the reader. But there is no second sentence which can be imagined in this example, and therefore the use of the word **م** implies, perhaps, a repetition of the first: "He is a good servant of God, and again he is a good servant of God, who offers his supplications at the throne of God;" &c. The effect of this repetition would be to convey an idea very similar to that signified by the word **م** RESTRICTION, as already explained.

م CERTAINLY.

THIS is probably a contraction for **م** "Resembling each other;" and is therefore synonymous with **م**, employed for **م**, in the following example from the SHAN NAMA: **م** "Among the number of experienced and chosen chiefs," **م** "There are none in the world who are equal to you." According to the etymological meaning of the word **م**, it ought, therefore, to be employed in the sense of APPARENTLY; and there are doubtless many examples, in which it may be accurately translated by that word. Generally speaking, it seems to be employed, like the word **م**, in the sense of CERTAINLY; and is therefore considered as a **م** OF WORD OF CORROBORATION, though it has, in fact, no real fluctuations of sense. Example:

م "Such an admirable form as that of my beloved, could never be created of dust,"

م "SURELY (or APPARENTLY) fate has made it of the matter of heart and spirit;" &c.

Ho!

THIS is a **کلمه تنبيه** or WORD OF ADMONITION, and is of rare occurrence in the Persian Language. Example: **مردا، مردان جوان مردا،** "Ho! you who are brave, you who are manly, Ho!" &c. There is nothing to be observed on its nature and application to the purposes of speech.

Ho!

THIS also is a **کلمه تنبيه** or WORD OF ADMONITION, having the sense of Ho! as **گفتم اين را دليلش بايد گفت** "I said to him, give me a proof of this?" **گفت داني کي چي گفتم** "And he replied, Ho! Do you know what you say?" As a substantive verb, in the sense of **است** IS, we have the inflexions **مستم** I AM, **هي** HE IS, and **است** sometimes contracted into **هند** THEY ARE. I remember no example of **مستم** and have already furnished an example of **هي** in PAGE 307 OF THIS VOLUME. The following examples of **است** and **هند** are extracted, the first from the MUSNOVVE OF MOLOVER ROOM; and the second from the SHAH NAMA OF FIRDOUSEE. **گفت باري که ترا خاصان بستند** "He said, O God! who are thy favorites?" **که ميست رک گفت و فرخ يائي اند** "For they are truly fortunate and happy." **مشاد و برپاشان شد، راز من** "My secrets have been unfolded to them;" **پهرينست و به استند انبار من** "And they participate with me in all my affairs."

Any.

THERE is little to be observed on the application of this word to the purposes of speech. It may be employed alone:

..

as "Have you seen any thing?" or "Do you know any thing?" (of such an affair;) or it may be followed by a substantive noun: as *پہنچ مٹھ کر اہم سنن آؤزار* "No censures shall induce me to fly from thee." In this case, it has the effect of an indefinite article; and may be considered as superfluous when followed by a noun which is itself followed by an indefinite article: as *پہنچ کسی* "Any person;" or "Any one person;" *پہنچ جسری* "Any thing;" or "Any one thing;" &c. In answer to a question, it is often translated by the word NOTHING: as *بدوگت گانی دتہر پہنچ پہنچ*

"He said to his beloved, O my charmer;"

زینت پر آور دوگت پہنچ "What booty have you brought me? and she replied, Nothing." It is plain, however, that the negative *پہنچ* "I have brought nothing," is understood in all the examples of this class.

Ho! *ہو*

THIS word, which is spelt with YA MAAROOF, is a *کلمہ تنبیہ* OR WORD OF ADMONITION, having the sense of *Ho! HAVE A CARE!* &c. Example:

جان بابا گویدت ایس منین "The devil will address you in the language of flattery. Ho! then, Have a care!"

left that accursed DEMON should lead you astray. It may be repeated for the sake of HYPERBOL: as *ہو منین آئی راہ روپی گاہ* "Have a care!

آفتاب غمگین ہوئی جاہ "you traveller, the time wears late;" "And the sun of your life descends to the well." From

ہو منین is formed *ہو منا منین*, which is sometimes employed as a substantive noun, having the sense of *Over-hastiness*. Example: *رخصتہ کر د تقسم حای مرا* "He made a

hole

hole in the arrangement of my condition;

در چنان دار و گزیده بنامین with all that authority and over-hastiness;” &c.

۱. Or.

THIS word, according to its proper acceptation, is supposed to denote the relation of REPULSION, known in Grammar by the term **زید**. It has no real fluctuations of sense, and the following rules for its practical use have little importance in my estimation.

R U L E F I R S T.

It is employed in the case of **شک** or DOUBT; and this happens when the speaker means to imply, in his own mind, the existence of a DOUBT with regard to the accuracy of both or either of two propositions, connected together by the word **یا**. Example: **زید آید یا بکر** “Is ZYDE come, or is BUKR?” The answer may be that “Either is come;” that “Neither is come;” or that “Both are come.” But if the speaker knows that one of them is come, and desires merely to ascertain which, the word **یا** may still be employed; and the question is then **برای طلب تمیز**. Example: **آیا درین خانه زید است یا بکر** “Is it ZYDE who is in this house, or BUKR?” (since the speaker knows that one of them is certainly there.)

R U L E S E C O N D.

It is employed to indicate the relation signified by the term **ابهام**; and this happens, when the speaker, having no doubt in his own mind, expresses himself in such a manner as may be supposed to create doubts in the mind of his hearer. Example: **چرخ است این یا قمر یا لاله قرمز است این** “Is this the face of my beloved, or is it a moon, or is it a crimson tulip?” &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It may be employed to indicate the relation of **DETAIL**, known in Grammar by the term **تَقْبِیْل**; and in this case, the speaker has no doubts of his own, nor does he desire to inspire the reader with doubt. Example:

“A word is either noun, verb, or particle.” Or the relation signified by the term **تَقْبِیْل** in which case, there is a **CHOICE** offered between two propositions, both of which cannot be adopted. Example: “Marry this woman or her sister.” And if the adoption of both shall happen to be admissible, the relation is then known in Grammar by the term **اِبَاحَت**. Example: “Study the LAW, or the science of RHETORIC;” &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is supposed to denote, occasionally, the relation of **EQUALITY**, known in Grammar by the term **مِثَالَات**.

Example: “Whether you come or not, I will go to visit you.” Or the relation known by the term **اِضْرَاب** and more commonly expressed

by the word **بَل**. Example: “Zyde is not a physician;”

“He is either a Grammarian or a Logician.” Or the relation known by the terms **غَايَت** و **مُخَرَّض** and more commonly signified by the particle **تَا**. Example:

“I will not quit the pursuit of my object;” “Until you comply with my wishes, or promise to do so.” Or the relation of **CONJUNC-**

tion, which is commonly signified by the particle **AND**. Example: **ربا یا خبانت هرگز نکن** "Never practice fraud or hypocrisy," &c.

R U L E F I F T H.

It is supposed to be occasionally employed in a **CONDITIONAL SENSE**, like the particle **اگر** *If*. Example:

این کار من بجا می آید "I will do this for you,"

یا حاجت من را روا کنی یا دران باب سفارش می بکنی "If you will grant my desire, or if you will intercede in my favor for a given object;" Or to form a **ضرب استیثا** or **PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION**, like the word **مگر** : as

ترا قهقوس خواهم بست "I will imprison you,"

یا تو توبه کنی یا ضمان بدهی "Unless you repent or provide security," &c.

C O N C L U S I O N.

I THINK it probable that the reader will criticise many of the preceding examples, some of which are perhaps insufficient to establish the principles which they are brought to illustrate. In fact, the practical use of the word **یا** *Or*, admits of little illustration by the rules of Grammar; and I should have been disposed to spare the reader's attention to the subject, had I not considered, *first*, that the Persian word **یا** represents the united force of several Arabic particles distinguished from each other in point of sense, as **وَأَمْ**; and **وَأَمْ**; and, *secondly*, that the preceding rules for its practical use, comprising examples of its occurrence in the sense of each of these three Arabic particles, may not, therefore, be wholly destitute of advantage to the learner.

THIS

بار

THIS word properly signifies BELOVED, and is sometimes employed in the sense of a LOVER. As a termination, it seems to be one of the **حَسْبُ وَفِي** or RELATIVE PARTICLES, described in VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 439 OF THIS WORK. Examples: **رَمْبَار** "A shepherd, primitive **رَمْبَار** "A flock," **وَامْبَار** "A huntman," primitive **وَامْبَار** "A net; **آب بَار** "A man employed to water the fields of the husbandman," **مَشْبَار** "The name of a medicine taken at night," &c. &c.



(

NOTES
TO THE
SECOND VOLUME.

NOTES TO THE SECOND VOLUME,

NOTE FIRST.

PAGE 41.

I HAVE imputed to Mr. TOOKE, an intention to prove the following proposition; namely, that "all the particles of every Language, *must* have been originally verbs or nouns." By the use of the term *MUST*, I did not mean to ascribe to Mr. TOOKE the absurdity of denying the possibility of forming a Language on artificial principles, since it is plain that PSALMAN-AZAR, for example, might form the fictitious Language of FORMOSA on artificial principles; in which case, he would be likely enough to employ particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. All I meant to assert was merely this: that "the result of Mr. TOOKE's enquiries seems to have impressed on his mind, a very strong conviction of the fact that all the particles of every Language may be traced to their origin as verbs or nouns." Still, the fact is not argued by Mr. TOOKE as a matter of necessary and immutable truth; for his arguments are all drawn from the history of Language, and as he reasons from what is known to what is unknown, supporting his conclusions by the evidence of analogy, so it is plain that he could not hope to attain demonstration, and has aimed only at the highest probability. I am sorry therefore, to have employed the term *MUST*, which is certainly liable to misapprehension; and shall be always ready, as soon as discovered, to rectify any

any mistake or misconception of his opinions that may have inadvertently crept into my work.

NOTE SECOND.

PAGE 45.

It has been said that "Language is an art invented by artless men," and though the structure of the Arabic Language evinces the most consummate art and skill, I shall still be called on, (if these disquisitions should excite the attention of European reasoners,) to explain how it is possible to concede to the first rude cultivators of Language, the art implied in the invention of primitive particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. The arguments against their invention are partly, I think, of a speculative nature; and those employed on the other side of the question must also partake of the same character. For my part, I admit that the subject is full of difficulty, and as I cannot trace in my mind's eye, a satisfactory map of the origin and progress of human Speech, I venture, with the utmost diffidence, to offer the following opinions on the subject.

If Speech were inspired by the Deity, there can be no difficulty with regard to the invention of primitive particles; and if, on other hand, Language be considered as of human origin, it follows of necessity that there was a period of time antecedent to that in which it was employed. The time, however, I presume to be short; because I conceive that we are naturally speaking, as well as reasoning animals; by which I mean to state my opinion that "no human society could exist together for a week or a day, without conceiving ideas, and without an attempt to express them to each other." Our tongues are our own, as much as our legs; and it seems to me equally unreasonable to believe that we should long refrain from the use of either. Every child utters a variety of articulate

articulate sounds, which yet belong to no Language on earth; and those very sounds acquire a significant character in the nursery, where they are well understood by the child and its nurse. These two teach each other the first rudiments of a rude Language, which is afterwards laid aside by the child, for no reason in the world but one; namely, because there is another Language, already established, which is much better adapted to the purposes of Speech. Take away the established Language, and the child would continue, during its future life, to designate WATER (for example,) by that arbitrary articulate sound (as GUM) which it may have uttered by instinct in the nursery, on the first presentation of water to its view.

BUT if Language be instinctive to the human race, it is an abuse of terms to call it an invention; and we might talk with as much propriety of the invention of walking, sleeping, or eating, as we now do of the invention of Language. If there be any invention in the case at all, it must be therefore sought for, in my opinion, not in the origin, but in the progressive improvement of human Speech; and the question should be decided, not so much by speculative arguments, as by the weightier evidence of stubborn facts. There is invention, certainly, or to use a better term, there is obvious artifice, if not in the word **عِلْم** KNOWLEDGE, at least in the derivatives formed from that noun: such as **اِسْتِلاَم** "Communicating knowledge or information;" **اِسْتِثْلَام** "Asking knowledge or information;" **تَعْلِيم** "Conveying instruction, or Teaching;" **تَعْلَم** "Receiving instruction, or Learning;" &c. And the artifice manifested in the formation of these few words, seems to me to indicate more skill in the first rude cultivators of Language, than would be necessary to the inflexion of a substantive noun by the simple expedient

pedient of artificial terminations: as PENNA ; PENNÆ ; PENNIS ;
PENNAS ; &c.

I CANNOT, therefore, concede the point maintained by Mr. **TOOKS** and his followers, that " Language was invented by artless men;" for the whole structure of the Arabic Language indicates the practical art or skill of the inventors, though utterly ignorant of the theory of Speech; and partial as I am to the Arab character, I cannot believe that they alone, among all mankind, had the wit to discover the utility of art, and the honor (exclusively) to apply it to the improvement of their own Language. On the contrary, I infer the use of art in every other Language, because it must be conceded to this Language, and has never been banished from other Tongues by any Grammarian, but Mr. **TOOKS** and his followers, who have by no means established their point by such evidence as a reflecting man can be reasonably required or disposed to admit as absolutely conclusive on such an occasion. I say, therefore, that many **TERMINATIONS** in various Tongues have been formed, in all probability, on artificial principles; and if so, they cannot now be traced to their origin as nouns or verbs. And if the fact be admitted in the cases of **TERMINATIONS**, it cannot, I think, be reasonably denied in the case of **PREPOSITIONS**; which certainly perform the same functions, and are, to all intents and purposes, essentially the same in their nature and character. For it is merely accidental to our Language, that we prefix the preposition to the substantive noun, as **TO LONDON**; whereas, in other Languages, it follows the noun, as **LONDON TO**; or coalesces with it in the form of a termination, as **LONDON TO**. The nature of the word **TO** cannot be affected by the occurrence of such unimportant accidents as these; and whether we call it a preposition, a postposition, or a termination, is therefore a matter of no importance to its character, which remains unchanged under all the varieties of idiomatical usage.

IT

It seems to me, however, that Mr. TOOKE and his followers have opposed to the invention of primitive particles, an imaginary difficulty which has no existence in the nature of things. They deny the invention of those particles, because they cannot believe that savages sat down at their leisure, like so many Philosophers, to invent prepositions, terminations, and conjunctions; a species of words representing ideas not obvious to the senses, nor easily intelligible, even at this day, without reference to the examples in which they occur. Now it is clear to me that the intersecting letter YA, in the word كَرِيم, made its first appearance in the middle of that, or some other Arabic word; and though it has been since separated from the radical كَرِم, with much advantage to the studies of those who sit down to acquire the Language by rule, I hold the Grammarians entirely responsible for that separation, which never, certainly, entered into the imagination of the rude inventor of the word كَرِيم.

THE terminations of our Language (if they were artificial,) must have been invented in the same manner; and thus the letter s of the plural number, made its first appearance at the end of a noun, as MOUNTAINS; RIVERS; STREAMS; &c. from which (in idea) it was never separated, until Grammarians began to pull the Language to pieces. I hold the same creed with regard to the invention of prepositions and conjunctions; which arose naturally in the progress of Language, and made their first appearance in a state of combination; or in other words, in the structure of a sentence. Considered in this point of view, I do not believe that there is more difficulty in the invention of a preposition, or a conjunction, than there is in the invention of many substantive nouns, representing ideas of an abstract nature, some of which are very nicely distinguished from others by sense: as EMULATION; ENVY; ANGER; and REVENGE; &c.

I CANNOT

I CANNOT conclude this note without expressing my desire to know if the ANGLO-SAXONS had any particles? If they had none, the fact proves the accuracy of Mr. TOOKE's system, considered with reference to certain Tongues; and the ANGLO-SAXONS must, in that case, be considered as very clumsy artificers of Speech. If they had fewer than ourselves, the same imputation may be thought to apply in a certain degree; or at least, we shall have better grounds than we have now, to determine the accuracy of that opinion by which it is maintained, that "Particles are not numerous in a rude Language." But if, as I suspect, the Language of the ANGLO-SAXONS was not deficient in the number of its particles, it will then be matter of curious speculation to determine, "why these particles were not adopted by us, in preference to certain nouns and verbs, which we have adopted, apparently, for no other purposes than that of reducing them afterwards to the rank of particles; a very unnecessary operation, if the ANGLO-SAXONS had particles ready manufactured to our hands."

NOTE THIRD.

PAGE 144.

I Copy the following Observations from the ELEMENTS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE HUMAN MIND.

OF ABSTRACTION.

THE origin of appellatives, or, in other words, the origin of those classes of objects which, in the schools, are called *Genera*, and *Species*, has been considered by some Philosophers as one of the most difficult problems in metaphysics. The account of it which is given by Mr. SMITH, in his dissertation on the origin of Languages, appears to me to be equally simple and satisfactory.

"THE assignation" (says he) "of particular names, to denote

note particular objects; that is, the institution of nouns substantive, would probably be one of the first steps towards the formation of Language. The particular cave, whose covering sheltered the savage from the weather; the particular tree, whose fruit relieved his hunger; the particular fountain, whose water allayed his thirst; would first be denominated by the words, cave, tree, fountain; or by whatever other appellations he might think proper, in that primitive jargon, to mark them. Afterwards, when the more enlarged experience of this savage had led him to observe, and his necessary occasions obliged him to make mention of, other caves, and other trees, and other fountains; he would naturally bestow upon each of those new objects, the same name by which he had been accustomed to express the similar object he was first acquainted with. And thus, those words, which were originally the proper names of individuals, would each of them insensibly become the common name of a multitude."

"It is this application (he continues,) of the name of an individual to a great number of objects, whose resemblance naturally recalls the idea of that individual, and of the name which expresses it, that seems originally to have given occasion to the formation of those classes, and assortments, which, in the schools, are called *Genera* and *Species*; and of which the ingenious and eloquent ROUSSEAU finds himself so much at a loss to account for the origin. What constitutes a species, is merely a number of objects; bearing a certain degree of resemblance to one another; and, on that account, denominated by a single appellation, which may be applied to express any one of them.

THIS view of the natural progress of the mind, in forming classifications of external objects, receives some illustration from a fact mentioned by Captain Cook in his account of a small island called Watceoo, which he visited in sailing from

New

New Zealand to the Friendly Islands. "The inhabitants," says he, "were afraid to come near our cows and horses, nor did they form the least conception of their nature. But the sheep and goats did not surpass the limits of their ideas; for they gave us to understand that they knew them to be birds." "It will appear," he adds, "rather incredible, that human ignorance could ever make so strange a mistake, there not being the most distant similitude between a sheep or goat, and any winged animal. But these people seemed to know nothing of the existence of any other land animals, besides hogs, dogs, and birds. Our sheep and goats, they could see, were very different creatures from the two first, and therefore they inferred that they must belong to the latter class, in which they knew that there is a considerable variety of species." I would add to Cook's very judicious remarks, that the mistake of these Islanders probably did not arise from their considering a sheep or a goat as bearing a more striking resemblance to a bird, than to the two classes of quadrupeds with which they were acquainted; but to the want of a generic word, such as quadruped, comprehending these two species; which men in their situation would no more be led to form, than a person who had only seen one individual of each species, would think of an appellative to express both, instead of applying a proper name to each. In consequence of the variety of birds, it appears, that they had a generic name comprehending all of them, to which it was not unnatural for them to refer any new animal they met with.

* * * * *

It seems to me that there are some objections to this theory; *first*, because it supposes every generic noun to have been originally the name of a single object; *secondly*, because it seems to imply that no noun can be entitled to the character of a generic name, which is not applicable to more than a single object; and, *finally*, because there is no proof, nor much

much probability in my opinion, that all the objects now distinguished by generic names did, in reality, appear in succession to the first rude cultivators of speech.

THE savage who invented the word ANT, or the word BEE, is likely, I conceive, to have seen more than a single ANT, or a single BEE; not only because these insects generally swarm together in great multitudes, but because their importance to man depends entirely on their numbers, without reference to which, they are too unimportant to have obtained the honor of a name at all. I cannot imagine, for example, that the man who had seen only a single LOCUST, would be in any haste to name an insect, individually considered, so insignificant; but if he chanced to observe a BODY OF LOCUSTS, advancing in large and dense clouds over the face of a great country; extending farther than the eye can reach; obscuring in their passage the rays of the Sun, and marking their progress by universal defoliation; then, indeed, the insignificance of the individual would be soon lost in the importance of the community, and Locusts would obtain the honor of a name.

I AM of opinion, therefore, that the word LOCUST (and so also of other generic nouns,) was not originally the name of an individual of that community, afterwards applied to other individuals, because of the resemblance of one to another; and I think, moreover, that the word SUN, though the name only of a single object, is in reality a GENERIC NOUN; (NOT A PROPER NAME;) in which case it cannot be admitted that generic nouns are necessarily the names of *more* than one individual object. On the contrary, I take it for granted, that every noun is a Generic name, which presents to the mind A GENERAL IDEA; though that general idea (as it happens in the case of the word SUN,) may not, perhaps, be observed to exist in more than one individual object. In this case, the difference between A GENERIC NOUN and A PROPER NAME, consists merely in this: that

that the former denotes " a general idea," which may be sometimes observed to exist only in a single object, and at other times, in many objects; and that the latter denotes " no general idea" and cannot, therefore, without a *new* act of convention, be applicable to more than a single object.

To explain by example. The word MOON is a generic name, because it presents to the mind a general idea; yet this general idea was not, until lately, observed to exist in more than one individual object. The invention of the telescope has, however, enabled us to discover that JUPITER, for example, has several Moons; and as the word MOON denotes a general idea, not less applicable to the Satellites of JUPITER than it is to the moon which enlightens our Earth; so, the term MOON, by its own nature, became applicable to the Satellites of Jupiter, as soon as these were discovered by the telescope. In this there was *no new act of convention*; because the word MOON, having no pretensions to the character of a proper name, is really applicable to as many objects as may be now or hereafter found to coincide with the nature of that general idea which it is formed to denote. The case is otherwise with the word JOHN, which, being in reality a proper name, presents no general idea to the mind of the hearer; whence it follows that though many men having the name of JOHN, do undoubtedly exist in the world, there is, in the case of each individual, *a new act of convention*, by which alone we are authorised to call him by the name of JOHN.

If I were disposed to speculate on the invention of generic nouns and proper names, I should say that the former, in all probability, are prior to the latter in the order of time; because it seems to me, on reference to the existing facts of the case, that "the latter have never been resorted to, until the insufficiency of the former has been first ascertained." We have generally proper names for MEN, SHIPS, MOUNTAINS, and RI-

VERS

WFRS, because the necessity is obvious in all these cases; but we have not generally proper names for STONES, TREES, HORSES, LOCUSTS and BEES, because the generic names of such objects have been found sufficient for all the ordinary purposes of Speech. In the cases of a given HORSE, or a given TREE, that may have been rendered remarkable by circumstances, we may, indeed, be observed occasionally to have recourse to the invention of a proper name; but this, I think, tends to confirm the opinion stated by me; namely, that generic nouns are prior, in the order of time, to proper names; by which they are now superseded, not universally, but only in certain cases where the want of proper names would be obviously attended with some inconvenience.

WITH regard to the true import of generic nouns, Philosophers, perhaps, may not be easily brought to agree; but the savage is not likely to reason on the nature and character of the words which necessity alone compels him to invent, though experience and practice will certainly teach him the just and proper application of all. On this subject, I shall merely remark that the similarity between two or more objects of the same species, must be still more striking when many are seen at the same time, than it can be, when each individual is seen in succession; and if we admit, therefore, that this similarity is, in the one case, the true reason why all are distinguished by the same name, it follows, a fortiori, that the same cause is likely, in the other case, to be followed precisely by the same effect. The savage who has seen a cloud of locusts at the same time, is still more likely to distinguish all by the same name, than his neighbour who has seen in succession a few individuals of that community. In truth, however, it cannot be admitted that "what constitutes a species, is merely a NUMBER of objects, bearing a certain degree of resemblance to one another;" for if one man only were left alive in the world, the species would continue to exist in that individual;

a clear proof that a plurality of individuals is not at all necessary to constitute a species.

It only remains to notice the observation of Captain Cook, on which, however, I have nothing to say. It is at variance with all the ideas which I should have been disposed, *a priori*, to form on the subject; and if there be no mistake in the facts of the case, it seems to me to set reason at defiance. The very extraordinary nature of the statement may, however, warrant a suspicion that Captain Cook was misled by his ignorance of the Language of those Islanders; and Professor STEWART would probably have made the same remark, had his theory, in this instance, led him to oppose, rather than to admit the authority of that celebrated navigator. If it were natural in those savages to confound the BIRDS of the air and the BEASTS of the field, we need not despair of discovering others who shall confound both with the FINNY RACE; since the term FISH includes a variety of species still more numerous, in all probability, than those included under the term BIRD.



P O S T S C R I P T.

I HAD scarcely printed the preceding sheet, when the following paragraph met my eye. It is contained in **VOLUME SECOND, PAGE 283**, of the translation of **ABOO TALIB'S TRAVELS**, lately published by Major **STEWART**; and seems to me to corroborate my opinion of the probable priority of **GENERIC NOUNS** to **PROPER NAMES**, by the relation of a fact so directly in point, that I cannot resist the temptation to transcribe it.

“ **THE** villages in the desert are so few, and at such a distance from each other, that they do not give them distinct (that is, proper) names :—They are therefore all called *Belaud* (towns.)”

BOOKS.

PRINTED AT THE HONORABLE COMPANY'S PRESS.

VOLUME First of the **MUCKAMAUTE HURBERS**; an Arabic Work of celebrity, well known to Oriental Scholars.

IN THE PRESS.

THE Second Volume of the same Work; comprising an Index and Translation into the Persian Language, of all the words contained in the Work. N. B. A part of the **MUCKAMAUTE HURBERS** has been published by **SCHULTENS**, with a Latin Translation, from which European readers may be enabled to form a judgment of the general merits and plan of the Work.

THE First Volume of the **SHAH NAMA**; collated and corrected for the Press by a body of learned Natives, employed by Government for that purpose at a considerable expence, and placed under the superintendence of the Persian Professor. Twenty-four Manuscript Copies of the **SHAH NAMA** have been obtained for the purposes of this publication; partly from the library of His Excellency the **NASIR VIZIER**; and partly from other individuals, eminent in Asia for rank or literature. The Editor is indebted to the liberality of General **MALCOLM**, for one of the most valuable copies of the Work; which was purchased in Persia, he believes at the price of 1,500 Rupees, having been written in that country about two hundred years ago, and apparently corrected with considerable care. Another copy, obtained by Mr. **MONCKTON**, boasts of double the antiquity of the former; and several others are more than three hundred years old. The Editor, more anxious for accuracy than rapidity of execution, believes that this great Work cannot be completed in less than six years. It will comprise Eight Volumes of nearly 500 Pages each, (Foolscap size;) and the First Volume will be very shortly issued from the Press.

A GRAMMAR of the Arabic Language, by the author of the Persian Grammar now offered to the Public. This Work is intended to comprise all the valuable information bequeathed to their country by the best writers on Arabic Grammar; and will necessarily embrace discussions of such length and difficulty, that the author does not chuse to be responsible for its early appearance.

PRINTED AT THE PERSIAN PRESS.

THE MOONTUKHUR OOL LOGHAUT; being a DICTIONARY OF ARABIC WORDS, with a PERSIAN TRANSLATION; according to the authority of THE KAUMOOS; THE SERAHH; THE KŪZ; THE MOOHUZZUB; &c.

FOUR VOLUMES OF SELECTIONS for the use of the Students of the Persian Class.

VOLUME FIRST, comprising a portion of the AKHLAUKE MOOH-SUNEE and the YOOSUFO ZULEEKHA.

VOLUME SECOND, comprising a portion of the GOOLIKTAEN and BOOSTAUN.

VOLUME THIRD, comprising a portion of the BABAURE DAUNISE and the DEEWANE SAUDEE.

VOLUME FOURTH, comprising a portion of the INSHAF ABOOL FUZZ and the SECUNDER NAMA.

IN THE PRESS.

VOLUME FIFTH, of the same Work, comprising the AKHLAUKE JŪLALIE and the LYLEE and MUJNOON, of Amcer Khosro.

**CALCUTTA:—PRINTED BY T. WATLEY,
At the Hon'ble Company's Press.—1810.**

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
491.55L97G1973 C001 V002
A GRAMMAR OF THE PERSIAN LANGUAGE; CALCU



3 0112 029134597